

# **For Reference**

---

**NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM**



Ex LIBRIS  
UNIVERSITATIS  
ALBERTAENSIS



High Level

BOOK BINDERY LTD.

10372 - 60 Ave., Edmonton









Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2021 with funding from  
University of Alberta Libraries

<https://archive.org/details/Volk1972>





THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA  
TEACHER EVALUATION IN AN URBAN SASKATCHEWAN  
FACULTY OF SCHOOL DISTRICT AND RESEARCH

by



ADOLF JOHN VOLK

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH  
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE  
OF MASTER OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1972





THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled "Teacher Evaluation in an Urban Saskatchewan School District," submitted by Adolf John Volk in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education.





## ABSTRACT

This study was designed to examine the perceptions of teachers in an urban Saskatchewan school district regarding the existing and preferred use of evaluation personnel, and the existing and preferred importance given to evaluation criteria.

The instrument consisted of four sections. The first section consisted of six personal and professional variables. The second section requested the scoring of nine listed types of personnel according to their existing and preferred use as evaluators. The third section requested the scoring of the thirty listed criteria according to the importance given to them in the existing and preferred evaluation situation. The fourth section invited teachers to make comments regarding evaluation and/or the study.

The statistical procedure utilized to analyze the data included frequency counts to determine the existing and preferred use of evaluators and evaluative criteria; the rank ordering of personnel according to their use "frequently" and "always" to allow comparisons to be made of the extent of use of these evaluators in the existing and preferred situation; the rank ordering of criteria according to the "great" and "very great" importance given





to them in the existing and preferred evaluation situation to allow comparisons to be made; Spearman rho calculations to determine whether any overall difference existed between the use of evaluators in the two situations and to determine whether any overall difference existed between the importance given to evaluative criteria in the two situations; chi square tests to determine significant relationships between the six personal and professional teacher variables and the existing and preferred use of evaluation personnel, and to determine significant relationships between the six personal and professional variables and the existing and preferred importance given to evaluation criteria; and a simple categorization of teachers' comments on the study.

Analysis of the data disclosed that teachers perceived and preferred the school board superintendent and the principal to be used extensively in teacher evaluation. There was no overall difference in the use of evaluators between the existing and preferred situation. Several significant relationships existed between the personal and professional teacher variables and the existing and preferred use of evaluators. Sixteen of the criteria were perceived to be given great importance in the existing situation, and twenty-eight of the criteria were preferred as important evaluation criteria. No overall difference between the existing and preferred criteria was found. The emphasis





was on process criteria for the existing and preferred situation. Several significant relationships existed between the personal and professional teacher variables and the existing and preferred evaluation criteria.



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to acknowledge his indebtedness to Dr. D. A. MacKay for his guidance and encouragement. The advice received from the other members of the committee, Dr. J. E. Seger and Dr. D. G. Tucker, is greatly appreciated.

The assistance and encouragement of the writer's colleague, Mrs. Margaret Haughey, is gratefully recognized.

The writer expresses his appreciation of the co-operation and support of the executive officers and the school board members of the urban Saskatchewan school district in which this study was conducted.

Finally, the writer wishes to acknowledge the unfailing assistance, confidence, encouragement, and patience of his wife, Maria.





## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
1. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM AND ITS SIGNIFICANCE . . . . .	1
STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM . . . . .	3
IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY . . . . .	4
BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY . . . . .	5
DEFINITION OF TERMS . . . . .	6
2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH . .	8
WHAT IS EVALUATION? . . . . .	9
THE PURPOSE OF EVALUATION . . . . .	10
PROBLEMS OF EVALUATION . . . . .	12
Problems of Definition . . . . .	13
Complexity and Variability . . . . .	14
Failure of Research . . . . .	16
Subjectivity . . . . .	17
Criteria and Measurement . . . . .	18
Teacher Anxiety . . . . .	18
Can Teachers be Evaluated? . . . . .	19
Dissatisfaction with Evaluation . . . . .	20
WHO SHOULD EVALUATE? . . . . .	21
External Evaluation . . . . .	21
Supervisors . . . . .	22
Principal . . . . .	23





Chapter	Page
Department Head . . . . .	24
Peer Evaluation . . . . .	25
Self-Evaluation . . . . .	25
Student Evaluation . . . . .	26
Team Evaluation . . . . .	28
METHODS OF EVALUATION . . . . .	29
EVALUATION CRITERIA . . . . .	31
Product Criteria . . . . .	33
Process Criteria . . . . .	34
Presage Criteria . . . . .	37
SUMMARY . . . . .	38
3. THE DESIGN OF THE STUDY . . . . .	40
SYNOPSIS OF THE PROBLEM . . . . .	40
THE INSTRUMENT . . . . .	41
COLLECTION OF DATA . . . . .	44
Source of Data . . . . .	44
Personal and Professional Data . . . . .	46
Statistical Procedure . . . . .	46
LIMITATIONS AND DELIMITATION . . . . .	50
Limitations . . . . .	50
Delimitation . . . . .	50
4. EVALUATION PERSONNEL . . . . .	51
PERCEPTIONS OF EXISTING AND PREFERRED EVALUATION PERSONNEL . . . . .	51
Existing Evaluation Personnel . . . . .	51



Chapter	Page
Preferred Evaluation Personnel . . . . .	53
COMPARISONS OF EXISTING AND PREFERRED EVALUATORS . . . . .	54
RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS AND THEIR PERCEPTIONS OF EXISTING EVALUATION PERSONNEL . . . . .	57
Level of Instruction . . . . .	58
Age . . . . .	61
Years of Teaching Experience . . . . .	64
Position Held . . . . .	64
Years of Post-secondary Education . . . . .	66
RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS AND THEIR PREFERRED USE OF EVALUATION PERSONNEL . . . . .	66
Level of Instruction . . . . .	69
Age . . . . .	72
Sex . . . . .	72
Years of Teaching Experience . . . . .	75
Position Held . . . . .	75
Years of Post-secondary Education . . . . .	75
SUMMARY . . . . .	79
5. EVALUATION CRITERIA . . . . .	81
PERCEPTIONS OF EXISTING AND PREFERRED EVALUATION CRITERIA . . . . .	81
Existing Evaluation Criteria . . . . .	81
Preferred Evaluation Criteria . . . . .	86
COMPARISONS OF EXISTING AND PREFERRED CRITERIA . . . . .	90





Chapter	Page
Spearman Rho Calculation . . . . .	94
Emphasis Placed Upon Categories of Criteria . . . . .	94
RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS AND THEIR PERCEPTIONS OF EXISTING EVALUATION CRITERIA . . . . .	96
Level of Instruction . . . . .	97
Age . . . . .	99
Sex . . . . .	103
Years of Teaching Experience . . . . .	105
Position Held . . . . .	105
Years of Post-secondary Education . . . . .	110
RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS AND THEIR PREFERRED USE OF EVALUATION CRITERIA . . . . .	110
Level of Instruction . . . . .	112
Age . . . . .	114
Sex . . . . .	114
Years of Teaching Experience . . . . .	117
Position Held . . . . .	120
Years of Post-secondary Education . . . . .	120
SUMMARY . . . . .	123
6. COMMENTS ON THE STUDY . . . . .	125
GENERAL REACTION TO THE INSTRUMENT . . . . .	125
EVALUATION PERSONNEL . . . . .	125
EVALUATION CRITERIA . . . . .	129
FREQUENCY OF EVALUATION . . . . .	130



Chapter	Page
GENERAL COMMENTS . . . . .	131
7. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS . . . . .	133
SUMMARY OF THE STUDY . . . . .	133
CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS . . . . .	136
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH AND STUDY . . . . .	141
REFERENCES . . . . .	143
APPENDIX A THE INSTRUMENT AND LETTERS . . . . .	154
APPENDIX B CRITERIA USED IN THE INSTRUMENT SET OUT IN CATEGORIES . . . . .	162





## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Classification of Responses to Questionnaires . . . . .	45
2. Personal and Professional Data . . . . .	47
3. Frequency of Mention of Personnel Employed for Evaluating Teacher Effectiveness . . .	52
4. Frequency of Mention of Personnel Preferred for Evaluating Teacher Effectiveness . . .	54
5. Rank Order of Evaluation Personnel . . . . .	56
6. Significant Relationships Between Level of Instruction and Perceived Use of Evaluation Personnel . . . . .	59
7. Significant Relationship Between Age of Respondents and Perceived Use of Evaluation Personnel . . . . .	62
8. Significant Relationships Between Sex of Respondents and Perceived Use of Evaluation Personnel . . . . .	63
9. Significant Relationships Between Years of Teaching Experience and Perceived Use of Evaluation Personnel . . . . .	65
10. Significant Relationships Between Position Held and Perceived Use of Evaluation Personnel . . . . .	67
11. Significant Relationship Between Years of Post-Secondary Education and Perceived Use of Evaluation Personnel . . . . .	68
12. Significant Relationships Between Level of Instruction and Preferred Use of Evaluation Personnel . . . . .	70



Table	Page
13. Significant Relationship Between Age of Respondents and Preferred Use of Evaluation Personnel . . . . .	73
14. Significant Relationships Between Sex of Respondents and Preferred Use of Evaluation Personnel . . . . .	74
15. Significant Relationship Between Years of Teaching Experience and Preferred Use of Evaluation Personnel . . . . .	76
16. Significant Relationship Between Position Held and Preferred Use of Evaluation Personnel . . . . .	77
17. Significant Relationships Between Years of Post-Secondary Education and Preferred Use of Evaluation Personnel . . . . .	78
18. Frequency of Mention of Criteria Employed in Evaluating Teachers . . . . .	83
19. Frequency of Mention of Criteria Preferred in Evaluating Teachers . . . . .	87
20. Rank Order of Existing and Preferred Evaluation Criteria . . . . .	91
21. Rank Order of Criteria Perceived to be Employed in Evaluating Teachers Grouped According to Mitzel's Categories . . . . .	95
22. Rank Order of Criteria Preferred to be Employed in Evaluating Teachers Grouped According to Mitzel's Categories . . . . .	96
23. Significant Relationships Between Level of Instruction and Perceived Importance Given to Evaluation Criteria . . . . .	98
24. Significant Relationships Between Age of Respondents and Perceived Importance Given to Evaluation Criteria . . . . .	100





Table		Page
25.	Significant Relationships Between Sex of Respondents and Perceived Importance Given to Evaluation Criteria . . . . .	104
26.	Significant Relationships Between Years of Teaching Experience and Perceived Importance Given to Evaluation Criteria . . . . .	106
27.	Significant Relationships Between Position Held and Perceived Importance Given to Evaluation Criteria . . . . .	107
28.	Significant Relationships Between Years of Post-Secondary Education and Perceived Importance Given to Evaluation Criteria . . . . .	111
29.	Significant Relationships Between Level of Instruction and Preferred Importance Given to Evaluation Criteria . . . . .	113
30.	Significant Relationships Between Age of Respondents and Preferred Importance Given to Evaluation Criteria . . . . .	115
31.	Significant Relationships Between Sex of Respondents and Preferred Importance Given to Evaluation Criteria . . . . .	118
32.	Significant Relationships Between Years of Teaching Experience and Preferred Importance Given to Evaluation Criteria . . . . .	119
33.	Significant Relationships Between Years of Post-Secondary Education and Preferred Importance Given to Evaluation Criteria . . . . .	121



## Chapter 1

### STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM AND ITS SIGNIFICANCE

Rapid developments in society, industry and technology have placed increased demands on education. These new demands and the accompanying expectations have led to a greater awareness of the need and value of education and have caused a greater concern about the educational programs provided by educational institutions and about the activities which take place in the teaching-learning situation. This awareness and concern has necessitated a public policy of placing the best teachers in schools and has demanded an accounting of teachers' efforts in the teaching process and of their effects on the learner. Such an accounting can only be given through some sort of summative evaluation of teacher effectiveness which should separate the competent teacher from the incompetent. However, evaluation of teacher effectiveness is not desired by the public alone for evaluation can also be formative and is, therefore, of immediate concern to the teacher involved and to school administrators who desire assistance in their professional growth and development.

Evaluation involves a process of assessment and a judgment. Whitworth (1968:124) suggested:



Evaluation comprises two main steps, the first that of assessing the situation usually by measurement, rating, or ranking, and the second that of making a decision as to how acceptable the status quo is. A third stage, often added, consists of judging what should be done and planning ahead . . . . In other words, evaluation consists of adding value judgments to observations, ratings, and test results covering some one situation.

An examination of this statement indicates that when evaluation is applied to teacher performance, the task becomes very complex. This observation is supported and emphasized by extensive research which has attempted to determine the qualities and characteristics of "good" teachers, the "best" teaching techniques and procedures, the effects of various methods of teaching on students, the predictability of teacher success, and a variety of other problems related to teacher performance and effectiveness.

Studies by Moore (1966), Thomas (1969), and Rogers (1970) have examined the problem of evaluating teacher effectiveness using Mitzel's process, product and presage criteria. Some articles have been written concerning the personnel responsible for the evaluation of teachers, but little agreement is evidenced in this regard. Most studies of this nature have ignored the views of the individuals who are the concern in these discussions and investigations, namely, the views of the teachers. This study was designed to examine the evaluation of teacher effectiveness from the point of view of teachers in an urban Saskatchewan school district.





## STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The major purpose of this study was to examine the perceptions of teachers in an urban Saskatchewan school district regarding (1) the existing and preferred evaluation personnel and (2) the existing and preferred evaluation criteria.

Specifically, the study was concerned with the following questions:

1. To what extent do certain individuals or groups fulfill the evaluation of teacher effectiveness function as perceived by teachers in an urban Saskatchewan school district?
2. Which individuals or groups responsible for teacher evaluation do these teachers prefer?
3. Is there a relationship between teachers' perceptions of existing evaluation personnel and the personal and professional variables of age, sex, years of teaching experience, years of post-secondary education, level of instruction, and position held?
4. Is there a relationship between teachers' preferences of evaluation personnel and the selected personal and professional variables?
5. What is the importance given to criteria employed in the evaluation of teacher effectiveness as perceived by these teachers?
6. Is there a relationship between teachers' perceptions



of existing evaluation criteria and the selected personal and professional variables?

7. Do urban school teachers perceive the emphasis to be placed upon process, product or presage evaluation criteria?

8. What importance given to evaluation criteria do these teachers prefer?

9. Is there a relationship between urban school teachers' preferences of evaluation criteria and the selected personal and professional teacher variables?

10. Do teachers in this school district prefer the emphasis to be placed upon process, product, or presage criteria?

#### IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

This study, believed to be the first of its kind conducted in an urban Saskatchewan school district has potential merit in that it should:

1. Provide an analysis of the existing evaluation system as perceived by teachers for those responsible for evaluation thereby enabling them to determine if these perceptions coincide with their own perceptions of the existing evaluation system regarding evaluation personnel and criteria. If these perceptions do not coincide, corrections can be made and reorganization can be sought.
2. Provide an analysis of evaluators and criteria preferred by these teachers thereby enabling those responsible for evaluation to accommodate these preferences. If such preferences are accommodated, the resulting increase in





co-operation and understanding will lead to a more effective formative and summative evaluation.

3. Indicate to the individuals or groups who are responsible for teacher evaluation what the role perceptions and role expectations of the teachers are.

4. Provide evaluators with an analysis of the relationship between teachers' perceptions and preferences regarding evaluation and selected personal and professional variables. Such an analysis will provide guidelines for approaching evaluation with particular individuals or groups.

5. Give teachers an opportunity to influence evaluation procedures by indicating their expectations and desires regarding evaluation.

6. Give teachers an opportunity to discover how other teachers perceive evaluation and what they prefer in this regard.

7. Focus attention on an area of educational concern. The information provided should be of interest to teachers, administrators, school boards, professional organizations and members of the community.

#### BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

All teachers are evaluated. Regardless of the formality of the evaluation, the method of collecting and analyzing evidence, and the procedure for reporting, teachers are evaluated and they are evaluated rather often by students, parents, other teachers, administrators,



supervisors, and the public. The questions facing teachers and administrators concern the extent of involvement that these individuals and groups should have in formal evaluations of teacher effectiveness, and how systematic the evaluation should be in order to be most effective. Since the emphasis on teacher evaluation has increased, and since teachers are the subjects of this process, the views of teachers concerning evaluation may provide considerable information concerning evaluation personnel and evaluative criteria.

#### DEFINITION OF TERMS

Evaluation--assessment by measurement, rating or ranking of teacher effectiveness involving value judgments based on observations. Such evaluation may be formative or summative. An elaboration of this definition is given on pages 9 and 10.

Product criteria--relate to measurable aspects of student growth, or change in attitude and behavior which can be attributed to the effect of the teacher.

Process criteria--refer to those aspects of teacher behavior considered to indicate teacher competence. They involve teaching methods, techniques and strategies, student-teacher relationships, and classroom situations.

Presage criteria--involve personal and professional



characteristics of the teacher, such as personality, appearance, training and intelligence.

Teachers--those individuals who are directly in the teaching process. This includes the principals who are the principal teachers in the schools. Teachers in this study were elementary and secondary school teachers with grade or grades taught ranging from kindergarten to grade twelve. The term instructor was used interchangeably with teacher.

Separate schools--are those schools in a specific district in which the minority of ratepayers, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, have established their own schools, in which they are liable only to assessments of such rates as they impose upon themselves, and whose legal base stems from the North West Territories Act of 1875, The Saskatchewan School Act, and The Secondary Education Act of 1964. The separate schools referred to in this study were Roman Catholic schools.





## Chapter 2

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH

Much has been written on the subject of evaluating teacher effectiveness. The views and evidence provided by research in this area are often contradictory. Forbes (1965) reported that the views held in this regard range from those which suggest that teacher quality is impossible to measure because of the complexity of the teaching-learning situation, to those which suggest that teacher effectiveness can be determined on the basis of a fifteen minute observation. This difference of opinion was further emphasized by Medley and Mitzel (1963:257) who suggested:

No fallacy is more widely believed than the one which says it is possible to judge a teacher's skill by watching him teach. It is difficult to find anyone, professional educator or layman, who does not think he himself, at least, can recognize good teaching when he sees it.

These views indicate some of the problems associated with this area of concern.

Numerous studies by individuals, school systems, and by teams of researchers have investigated separate facets of the teacher evaluation problem. Biddle and Ellena (1964:v) indicated some of the areas of concern and proposed that:

Probably no aspect of education has been discussed



with greater frequency, with as much deep concern, or by more educators and citizens than has that of teacher effectiveness--how to define it, how to identify it, how to measure it, how to evaluate it, and how to detect and remove obstacles to its achievement.

### WHAT IS EVALUATION?

Evaluation in education is a broad term covering all forms of judgments, including ratings or rankings, in which the degree of suitability or acceptability is measured and described. Evaluation of teacher effectiveness may be formative (for the purpose of promoting the professional growth and development of the teacher) or summative (for the purpose of official reporting of the effectiveness of the teacher which may lead to a decision regarding the acceptability of teacher performance). Ryans (1963:292) has taken the position that teacher evaluation is partly dependent on the attributes of the teacher and partly dependent on the teaching situation. He suggested that:

Teacher description is concerned with the identification, inventorying, and determination of interrelationships of teacher characteristics and behaviors. Teacher evaluation, on the other hand, involves judgments of the quality of teacher behaviors--judgments made in light of agreed-upon educational objectives, expectancies of individuals or groups, and other evaluative criteria approved by the schools and the community.

In evaluating teachers, the emphasis is on making judgments in relation to objectives, not on judging the personal worth of people. Vander Werf (1958:55) pointed out that teacher evaluation:



. . . must always place its emphasis on the emerging, qualitative, and aesthetic aspects of professional performance, whether it be in the classroom, in the community, or in the profession itself.

### THE PURPOSE OF EVALUATION

The reasons presented for evaluating teachers are numerous. These reasons can be generally categorized as (1) the public reason; (2) the professional reason; and (3) the administrative reason.

The public reason. Teachers are responsible to parents and the general public for providing their children with the best possible learning experiences and to ensure each child a quality education. In order to ensure that this is being accomplished evidence must be provided in terms of prespecified goals and objectives. Such an accounting cannot be given without evaluating teachers and the effects of their teaching upon the students in their charge.

The professional reason. Teachers are evaluated so that their teaching can improve and reach its potential. In this regard Vittetoe (1971:7) stated:

The old assumption that teachers are qualified to teach if they have a college degree is rejected now by those who see that we must find a way to evaluate teachers, eliminating the ones that are poor, eventually rewarding those that are good, and above all improving the product--that is, the kind of individual that our colleges and universities are developing for the profession.





The administrative reason. The administrative reason is primarily concerned with administrative decisions about the effectiveness of teachers. As Rogers (1970:16) stated: "Teacher evaluation leads to the determining of the salary, tenure, dismissal, and promotion of the teacher." Although this reason is similar to the public reason noted above, it differs in that it involves a decision about change of the teacher's status.

A study of teacher evaluation procedures conducted by the Educational Research Service (1969:71) in 211 local school systems in the United States identified ten ways in which teacher evaluation might be used. These are (in rank order of importance as identified by the teachers surveyed):

1. To assist in improving teaching competence.
2. To keep the administration aware of what is going on in the classroom.
3. To make teachers more responsive to needs of their pupils.
4. To make it possible to dismiss poor teachers.
5. To assist in the selection of teachers for promotion to other positions.
6. To have a statement in the teacher's permanent record for future reference.
7. To see if the curriculum is being followed.
8. For advancement on the salary schedule.
9. For the awarding of merit pay.
10. Other.

The major emphasis and reason for evaluating teachers is to bring about improvement in teaching and learning. McNally (1972) indicated that there are four views of how evaluation of teachers can do this: (1) when teachers are evaluated they are motivated to do better; (2) during the evaluation process the supervisor teaches



the teacher how to teach; (3) evaluation stimulates the teacher to evaluate himself; and (4) evaluation is a co-operative study not only of the teacher but also of the entire learning situation which leads inevitably to improvement of children's learning experiences.

#### PROBLEMS OF EVALUATION

The difficulty of evaluating teachers arises from problems associated with (1) defining what is to be evaluated, (2) evaluating a complex phenomenon, (3) the failure of research to produce substantial and significant results, (4) subjective evaluation, and (5) the inadequacy of programs for the measurement and prediction of teacher effectiveness. These problems have led many researchers and practitioners, as well as teachers, to become suspicious of evaluation practices and to question the entire procedure. Byrne (1962:19) pointed out that in spite of the problem associated with teacher evaluation, laymen do not shrink from the task:

Most people believe that the identification of good teaching is a simple matter. What community is not prepared to judge the quality of its teaching staff? What student does not have convictions regarding the competence of his teachers? And what school board hesitates, at the slightest provocation, to pontificate the nature of effective instruction? . . . For those charged with the responsibility of evaluating teaching, however, the task is not quite so simple. School administrators are keenly aware of the complexity of teaching. They are not always positive what teacher is a good teacher.



## Problems of Definition

The problem of definition is basic to the problem of teacher evaluation. Definitions of good teaching, teacher effectiveness, and teacher competence are often unsupported by research evidence and are as numerous as the number of evaluators. Mueller (1971:229) in reviewing numerous research studies, concluded that:

Although research has identified teacher characteristics and behavior and developed instruments to record objectively what goes on in the classrooms, no overall definition of what constitutes good teaching has yet evolved from the research.

A similar problem exists in attempts to define teacher competence and teacher effectiveness. Getzels and Jackson (1963:575) pointed out that there is evidence showing a lack of agreement about a definition of teacher effectiveness in that "teachers, students, and supervisors differ on what constitutes teacher effectiveness."

Most researchers indicated that teacher competence and teacher effectiveness have the same meaning. Biddle (1964), Byrne (1965), and Medley and Mitzel (1962) defined teacher competence in the same manner. Medley and Mitzel (1962:317) stated:

The competence of a teacher is defined as the average success of all his behaviors in achieving their intended effects. Strictly speaking, we cannot assess the competence of a particular teacher unless we know what effects he is seeking to achieve . . . . The competent teacher is one who is able to produce those effects he intends to produce.

A similar definition is given for teacher effectiveness. Flanders (1969:1423) proposed:





Teacher effectiveness is an area of research which is concerned with relationships between characteristics of teachers, teaching acts, and their effects on the educational outcomes of classroom teaching.

Medley and Mitzel (1962), Biddle (1964) and Byrne (1965) elaborated on this definition and suggested that teacher effectiveness also includes the effects of a given situation or context.

Barr (1961), Ellena (1961), and Turner and Fattu (1961:10) summarized the problem as follows:

One of the most difficult problems in the study of teacher effectiveness has been whether to assume that "effectiveness" is a statement about an attribute of the teacher, whether it is a statement about an attribute of a teacher in a particular teaching situation, or whether it is a statement about the results which come out of the teaching situation.

#### Complexity and Variability

Researchers engaged in the study of teacher effectiveness agreed that it is a difficult area of study because it involves a wide range of human phenomena, qualities and skills and because the results of teaching must be observed in delayed and inferential fashion.

Anderson and Hunka (1963:75) asserted:

Teaching is a complex business and any psychometric approach to the measurement of teaching success which assumes that there are common and stable factors in the teacher and his environment must meet with indifferent success. Teaching proficiency is multidimensional and there are many kinds of effectiveness for different kinds of teachers, programs and situations.

Many practitioners and researchers (Bolton, 1971; Ratsoy, 1971; Flanders, 1969; Smith, 1967; Lawler, 1964;



Ryans, 1963) agreed that a teacher functions in a highly complicated setting, in which his performance is influenced by the interaction of his personal characteristics and various situational variables. Flanders (1969) suggested that teacher behavior varies from one time period to the next according to the nature and purpose of the learning activities. Lawler (1964) emphasized that teachers' classes vary and concluded that a fair evaluation of a teacher's performance can only be made on the basis of several years experience. Gallagher (1968) agreed with this view and added that a teacher's style can only be ascertained if numerous evaluations are made. Ratsoy (1971) cautioned that situational variables such as characteristics of the physical setting, the instructional objectives, the materials being used, and the goals of the institution must also be recognized and considered when evaluating teachers. In this regard, Turner (1970:158) concluded from his review of several research studies:

Considered in its entirety, the empirical evidence contained in the studies noted above seems to the writer to support the contention that good teaching is a contextual phenomenon. Moreover, the effects of contextual variables are not limited to a single criterion outcome such as student reports and evaluations, but also appear when student achievement is considered critical.

The interaction of these variables further emphasizes the difficulty of teacher evaluation.



## Failure of Research

Researchers who have reviewed the extensive studies of teacher effectiveness and teacher evaluation concluded that these studies have been inconclusive and have added little to our knowledge. Soar (1964:287) concluded:

Despite an extensive literature accumulated over the years, one of the central points on which reviewers agree is that very limited progress has been made toward prediction and assessment. The number of studies in which objective procedures for evaluation have been used represent only a small fraction of the total, and of these, the variables measured have often been limited in breadth and peripheral in importance.

This conclusion was in agreement with the conclusions of the authors of the chapters on teaching methods, teacher personality, and social interaction in the classroom in the well-known Handbook of Research on Teaching (N. L. Gage, ed., 1963) who also stated that the research evidence was inconclusive.

Although these conclusions may lead to a pessimistic attitude, Gage (1967:15), having examined more recent research, sounded a note of optimism for the future:

More complex research designs capable of taking more categories of significant variables into account are now being propounded. The psychological, educational, and methodological sophistication of research workers is being greatly raised by greatly improved predoctoral and post doctoral training programs. And more adequate financial support is providing better organizations and facilities for educational research and development. The faith persists that educationally significant differences can be consistently produced in the future as new intellectual and material resources are brought to bear on educational problems.





## Subjectivity

The problem of evaluation of teacher effectiveness is compounded by the lack of objectivity in evaluation. Researchers pointed out that subjectivity in evaluating teachers continues to frustrate evaluators, teachers, and those who depend upon evaluation for teacher selection, promotion, and development. In this regard, Hawkins and Stoops (1966:344) concluded that:

Training and experience . . . are about the only objective evaluation measures of teacher differences we have found; yet they have generally been omitted from the evaluation process.

Evaluation of teachers involves value concepts and value judgments. Ryans (1963:292) suggested that value systems on which judgments are based "grow out of one's personal biases, preferences, beliefs, opinions, and attitudes; all of which vary substantially from one individual to the next." This comment was in agreement with that of Barr (1961:5) who stated that in

. . . uncontrolled situations the judgments of a group of supervisors and administrators, all observing the same teacher teach at the same time, under identical conditions, may vary so much that some observers may rate a particular teacher as among the very best they have observed.

This lack of agreement among evaluators was demonstrated by Worth's (1961) experiment involving Canadian school administrators.

Worth's (1961) study of 128 Canadian administrators observing and evaluating the same lesson demonstrated that the range of evaluative comments was from exceptional to



weak. In each of the twelve areas of instructional awareness--classified from the free responses of the administrators--the teacher was both highly praised and severely criticized. From this evidence, Worth concluded that the raters were not guided by any common definition of good teaching and theory of learning.

Worth's (1961) study was supported by Flanagan (1961:329) who concluded from his own research:

Regardless of the meaning of supervisory ratings, teachers are usually judged by their superiors and administrators. In general, these evaluations are made upon the basis of general impressions made of the teacher in many personal contacts, in observing classroom performance, and upon reports from others, rather than a single objective measure of teaching efficiency . . . Regardless of what else the teacher may have done, right or wrong, if he pleases the administration he is rated highly and consequently is considered to be a good teacher.

### Criteria and Measurement

In addition to the problems associated with evaluating teacher effectiveness indicated above, problems also exist in relation to evaluation criteria and measurement techniques. These problems are discussed later in this chapter under separate headings.

### Teacher Anxiety

Klahn (1965) suggested that because of unpleasant past experiences, evaluation poses a threat to many people. Changes in the teacher may be precipitated as a result of the process and when changes are possible, teachers feel vulnerable. Brown (1962), while investigating the effects



of stress-inducing supervisory behavior on the performance of teachers, found that stress or threat induced into the teaching situation generally caused a deterioration in teaching performance, particularly in those aspects involving pupil rapport, interaction, warmth and personal understanding. The performance exhibited by the teacher would not, therefore, be representative of his best efforts.

### Can Teachers be Evaluated?

In view of the many problems associated with teacher evaluation, the question of the ability to evaluate teachers remains to be answered. There appears to be no general agreement on this matter for there are as many people who say that it can be done as there are who say that it can not be done.

Beery (1962) asserted that the elusiveness of human traits, the complexity of teaching and learning, and the variety of desired teaching outcomes have prevented the discovery of any simple and objective measure of teaching, and he doubted that such a measure could ever be devised. Ellena (1961) reported the views of Rabinowitz and Travers (1953) who proposed that the distinction between effective and ineffective teachers cannot be made without value judgments which makes the effective teacher a fiction in the mind of man. Laurits (1967:35) defined teaching as a process by which changes in behavior are effected in an individual and concluded:





Our definition of teaching supports the view that the evaluation of individual teachers leads nowhere, for the definition asks us to examine life through the eyes of the student himself, to evaluate the larger experiences that the student is having in the school.

Among those who proposed that teachers can be evaluated were Heil and Washburn (1962), Barger (1965), and Ryans (1967). The findings of the Heil and Washburn (1962) study of teacher effectiveness involving fifty-five teachers and their students provided evidence that there are identifiable types of teachers and that different types have different effects on the children whom they teach; certain ones seemingly are more effective than others. Barger (1965:15) contended that teaching is not too complex to be evaluated objectively for "teaching is a specific form, or set of forms, of habitual human behavior; it is observable, measurable, analyzable, differentiable, and modifiable." Ryans (1967) supported this view but only conditionally. He held that either unidimensional or multidimensional evaluation can be accomplished objectively if agreement can be reached on evaluation criteria and on weights given to different aspects of teacher behavior.

#### Dissatisfaction with Evaluation

Teachers, like many administrators and supervisors, are frequently dissatisfied with evaluation. Freehill (1963) asserted that this is often due to unclear standards, brief observations, overemphasis on personal teacher characteristics, and evaluation of teachers in positions



unlike those for which they are recommended. Bolton (1971:4) suggested that teacher dissatisfaction is created where there is

. . . emphasis on fault-finding rather than helping teachers; when prejudice, bias, and poor judgments are used in collecting and analyzing information, and when communication is not open and honest.

These traditional aversions to evaluation have created an environment of ambiguity and frustration in terms of educational improvement.

#### WHO SHOULD EVALUATE?

In spite of the many problems associated with teacher evaluation, and regardless of the debate about whether teachers can or cannot be evaluated, the fact remains that teachers are evaluated by a variety of people. In most school systems, the responsibility for evaluating teachers is not the domain of any one individual, but rather it lies in the hands of a cadre of administrators who perform this function and in relation to the time allotted them for this task. The question of "who should formally evaluate teachers?" is often answered in numerous ways with a range from the students to external administrators; from individuals to teams of experts.

#### External Evaluation

In most Canadian provinces, evaluation of teaching is sometimes conducted by individuals or groups who are external to the actual school setting. These personnel



are often engaged in evaluating the school, and evaluate specific members of the school staff only in as much as they affect the operation of the school as a whole. On occasion they are engaged in evaluating individual teachers, but these evaluations only take place when specific, extraordinary and crucial problems concerning a teacher arise. Of such evaluations, Byrne (1965:306) stated:

External evaluation is commonly observed to be the least significant of all steps in the entire process. Its importance resides in its being the climax following a long period of self-appraisal. It provides intrinsic motivation for completing this extended period of critical self-examination.

From this observation, it would appear that the most significant evaluations are those internal to the school.

### Supervisors

Worth's (1961) study concerning evaluations by school administrators reported above has indicated some of the problems associated with supervisory evaluations. The lack of agreement of such evaluations was further supported by Barr (1958) who cited a research report by Webb and Nolan who found that when instructors were rated by their students and supervisors and by themselves, student ratings and self-ratings were highly correlated, and supervisors' ratings were correlated with self-ratings and additional measures of instructors' characteristics.

Some researchers, however, see supervisors' evaluations as having distinct advantages over other





evaluations for the psychological distance from the situation can enable them to view the situation objectively. This view was held by Moore (1966:19) who further suggested that it is "this psychological distance which enables him to make comparisons and to set standards of performance and which places him in the best strategic position to carry out evaluation."

### Principal

There is some argument regarding the principal's role in the formal evaluation of teachers' effectiveness. Enns (1965) and Andrews (1959) suggested that it is difficult for a principal to play the dual role of motivator and evaluator. They suggested that the principal's role involved provision of leadership, establishment of organizational climate, and a myriad of other tasks which involve supervisory contact with staff. They contended that evaluation which involves inspection and assessment would interfere with this role and that the two roles cannot be performed simultaneously.

Bargen (1965), McNally (1972) and McNeil (1971) did not agree with the foregoing premise. Bargen asserted that because of his role as educational leader and because of his proximity to the teaching situation, the principal is the most suited person to evaluate teachers. McNeil (1971:133) supported this view and stated that a "principal is remiss if he has not established and carried out a plan



for monitoring the effectiveness of teachers." McNally (1972:357) reviewed studies regarding this matter and concluded:

The multitude of studies that have been made on teacher evaluation leave no question that the principal is the key person in the program. It is the rare school system where the principal is not the person most responsible for teacher evaluation. It follows, then, that principals are the people on whom the quality, the nature, and the effectiveness of the evaluation program depend most.

Metzner (1970) cited research to show that teachers received a high rating from their principal if they shared the principal's educational beliefs, if they had harmonious relationships with colleagues, if they were good classroom teachers, and if they were sensitive to the needs of their students. In the face of this evidence he warned that evaluation by the principal may induce teacher conformity and create a tendency to rate teachers without reference to changes in their students.

#### Department Head

There are those who suggest that if teachers are to be evaluated, the evaluator should have some expertise in the teacher's subject area. Squire and Applebee (1964:9) agreed with this view and proposed:

Whether such evaluation means dismissal, tenure, or an additional salary increment, the teacher has a right to expect that the person who is most knowledgeable about him, his subject, and the varieties of teaching methods open to him should judge his competence. Although the school principal can judge in part and, in larger districts, the subject matter specialist can judge in part, the department chairman



is probably most highly qualified to weigh all parts.

### Peer Evaluation

The evaluation of teachers by their colleagues has received little attention from researchers. Although there has been some evidence provided by the research studies reported by Ellena (1961) that there is substantial agreement between peer and supervisor ratings, this area of investigation has been largely neglected. Moss (1971:16) submitted that:

Estimates of teacher effectiveness by colleagues visiting the classroom have been labeled ineffective since the colleagues are usually good friends and a few visits can not give the whole picture of a semester's teaching.

Brain (1965:35) pointed out that "how a teacher is viewed by his peers . . . appears to be more of a function of personality than of his teaching effectiveness."

### Self-evaluation

Recent studies in the area of teacher effectiveness have focused on the topic of teacher self-evaluation. Many researchers (Rose, 1958; Vander Werf, 1958; Flanders, 1964; Klahn, 1965; Joyce and Hodges, 1966; Laurits, 1967; Dial, 1970; Roberson, 1971; and Rasmussen and Holobinko, 1971) stated that this type of evaluation is most valuable for educational improvement. The reasons for supporting self-evaluations expressed by these researchers ranged from teachers being more aware of their own weaknesses than are





recognized by other members of the staff, to the belief that it is only through professional, dispassionate and scientific self-evaluation that improvement of instruction can be realized with long range effects. Roberson (1971: 469) indicated:

The results of intensive research and observation of the teaching-learning process in the classroom indicate that no one particular style of teaching can be declared the model for everyone; rather, the need appears to be for self-appraisal, the opportunity for each teacher to find and develop his own effective style.

Moss (1971:16), however, cautioned against this evaluation scheme because "the teacher is too close to the situation to make accurate or fair judgments about his own effectiveness."

A recent study of Alberta teachers conducted by Green (1971) which pertained to teacher attitudes and self-ratings of success in teaching also indicated caution in this regard. Green (1971:85) found that in self-ratings of teaching success (1) process criteria were most frequently chosen, (2) presage criteria were rated higher than process and product criteria, and (3) the self-rating was influenced by prior held attitudes, university training, sex, and age.

### Student Evaluation

Despite the fact that some teachers question the value and reliability of student evaluation of teacher competence, this procedure has received increased attention



in recent years. This is primarily due to the positive evidence provided by various research studies that student evaluations are accurate and reliable, and the belief that because students see teachers in day-to-day teaching situations, they cannot be ignored as evaluators.

Research conducted by Rayder (1968) demonstrated that there is no substantial relationship between student ratings of instructors and students' sex, age, grade point average, or grade(s) previously received from the instructor being rated. Moss (1971) and Bledsoe (1971) pointed out that research indicates that students are competent evaluators, that teachers' sex does not bias the evaluation, that students' ratings relate positively to a teacher's teaching and communicating ability, and that the results of student ratings are as reliable (self-consistent) as our better educational and mental tests.

The research conducted by Ely (1959) supported the proponents of student evaluations who believe that in spite of the possible shortcomings of such ratings, students do provide valuable information concerning the behavior of teachers. This aspect of student evaluation was supported by McBeath. McBeath's (1959) study related teacher behavior, as described on the Teacher Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, to teacher effectiveness. McBeath (1959: 110) concluded:

Students appeared to relate teaching effectiveness to the teacher's leader behavior and there was some



indication that they believed human relations behavior (Consideration) was more closely related to effectiveness than was goal accomplishment behavior (Initiating Structure).

Although the evidence supporting student evaluation of teachers is substantial, there is also some evidence which warrants caution when considering students as evaluators. Caution is warranted by personal characteristics of students which have been shown to influence ratings given to instructors. This was demonstrated by Anderson (1960) whose research study, cited by Flanders (1961), showed that dependent-prone students see teacher behavior differently than do the less dependent prone and that their expectations of the teacher's role is different. A similar study by Bledsoe (1971) revealed a stable, consistent, and positive relationship between pupil grade and teacher performance. This study showed that students who received high grades rated their teachers highly, and students who had received low grades gave teachers low ratings. No inconsistencies were found as one moved from "A" to "F" on the rating scale. Mueller (1971:230) cautioned that "too little research has been done on student rating to rely too heavily on this method of assessing the effectiveness of teachers."

### Team Evaluation

Some teachers are reluctant to be evaluated because of unpleasant evaluation experiences. Their fears and





anxieties are often produced when one evaluator rates their effectiveness on the basis of a brief observation and on limited information. One method of reconciling these fears and anxieties is by team evaluation. Klahn (1965:16) suggested:

A part of the total responsibility for evaluation of teaching rests with each professional person as he functions in his role as teacher, supervisor, and administrator. Evaluation will lack effectiveness if a composite picture does not evolve from the contributions of many evaluators.

This view was supported by Ryans (1967:56) who proposed that "the pooling of independent ratings of judges constitutes a reliable assessment of a teacher's performance," and by Vander Werf (1958) who submitted that teacher evaluation is a process involving the teacher, the immediately responsible administrator and another person. He further suggested that three conditions must be kept in mind for best possible results: evaluators (1) must have adequate training and preparation for this responsibility; (2) must be carefully selected for these positions; and (3) must be given enough time to make adequate appraisal.

#### METHODS OF EVALUATION

The two most common methods used in appraising teachers are rating scales and systematic observation. In these evaluation methods, four types of measures are used: (1) rank ordering--individuals are grouped according to some item; (2) forced distribution--each item is given a



percentage; (3) absolute category--behaviors are described by placing incidents into frequency or descriptive categories; and (4) verbal descriptors--perceptions are expressed. Simon and Boyer (1970) described seventy-nine observation schedules available for use, some of which focus on narrow aspects of classroom behavior while others are broader in scope. However, researchers point out that no approved methods of measuring teacher competence have been accepted.

Observations are usually poor measures of teacher effectiveness since results are ungeneralizable beyond the situation under observation and subject to observer bias. Medley and Mitzel (1963) pointed out that research workers indicated the inadequacy of this method because it is expensive in time and money, atypical behavior of the teacher is demonstrated when the observer is present, and previous studies which have employed this technique have had little success.

Rose (1958), Turner and Fattu (1960), Ellena (1961), and Soar (1964) indicated that the problems of ratings have been among the more frequent contributors to the difficulty of measurement. As in observations, ratings are also subject to bias, set, and irrelevant factors that intrude in rating. Ellena (1961:11) stressed this problem:

A rating scale constructed by those whose view centers on transmission of subject matter is likely to focus almost exclusively on how the teacher organizes and presents subject matter. A scale constructed by



one who conceives teaching as guiding learning activities is more likely to stress the skill of the teacher in manipulating the learning environment.

Despite the problems associated with measuring teacher performance, some positive indications are evident. Ornstein (1970) believed that some of the problems inherent in observation can be alleviated through rigorous observer training and the use of videotape recordings. Musella (1970) agreed with this latter technique and suggested that this would not only eliminate problems associated with measuring teacher competence but also would lead to teacher self-improvement.

#### EVALUATION CRITERIA

A key problem in evaluating teacher effectiveness is that of determining the basis for such evaluation. The evaluation picture remains obscure. Soar (1964:1) pointed out that the

. . . number of studies in which objective procedures for evaluation have been used represents only a small fraction of the total, and of these, the variables measured have often been limited in breath and peripheral in importance.

Various problems have already been examined in this review. Even if these difficulties are resolved, the complexity of determining the criteria on which teachers are to be evaluated still remains a difficulty. The question of what criteria will be used in evaluating teacher effectiveness remains unanswered since no common definition of "good"





teaching has been accepted.

Researchers have attempted to provide evidence of the criteria which best determine the effectiveness of teachers. Owens (1971:77) asserted:

Traditionally, researchers have addressed themselves to the study of the following criteria:

1. The results produced, or pupil gain as a measure of teacher competence.
2. The process employed in teaching, or actual classroom behavior.
3. Teacher characteristics, or the equipment the teacher possessed for teaching.

Many of these studies led to, or were related to, the general classification of criteria adopted by Mitzel (1960).

Mitzel (1960) reviewed research studies on teacher evaluation and analyzed the criteria problem. The analysis led him to propose a three-category framework of teacher effectiveness. The first category, product criteria, consists of changes in the student as a result of teaching.

These effects are variously called student gains, student growth or student changes, but they all involve measurement of change in student behavior, a portion of which logically can be attributed to the influence of the individual teachers. (Mitzel, 1960:1483)

The second category, process criteria, consists of those aspects of teacher and student behavior which are believed to be worthwhile in their own right. Mitzel (1960:1483) suggested that "they are often described and measured in the classroom in terms of conditions, climates, or typical situations involving the social interaction of student and teacher." The third category suggested by Mitzel is called presage criteria because it assumes predictive power on the



part of the criteria. These criteria assume a relationship to other criteria, either process or product. Mitzel (1960:1484) suggested:

There are at least four types of presage variables in common use as criteria in teacher effectiveness research: (a) teacher personality attributes, (b) characteristics of teachers in training, (c) teacher knowledge and achievement, and (d) in-service teacher status characteristics.

### Product Criteria

A great many pages have been written to demonstrate that the best measures of teachers' classroom performance are pupils' learnings. In their attempt to establish evaluation criteria, Morsh and Wilder (1954) summarized and synthesized 360 selected studies on teacher evaluation dating from 1900 to 1952 and concluded that the most direct and reliable criterion seems to be evidence of student change. Laurits (1967) supported this premise and proposed that the criterion is the degree to which desired change is attained. Mueller (1971) reviewed more recent studies and concluded that researchers still feel that student achievement is, on the whole, still the most reliable measure available.

Other researchers pointed out that there are many difficulties which intrude upon this prospect. Although Medley and Mitzel (1963) contended that the effects of teaching on pupils cannot be observed in normal classroom behavior but can be theoretically assessed without seeing



teachers teach, Biddle (1964) questioned if an individual teacher's contributions can be isolated and distinguished from those of others. Flanagan (1961) indicated that teacher ratings based on pupil gains and supervisory ratings of teachers did not correlate highly. Smith (1967:66) stated that "there is very little, if any, positive relation between ratings of teachers and achievement of their pupils." Ellena (1961:19) concluded that:

Though elaborate statistical and experimental methods have been developed, there is no one who can demonstrate a scientific way of making effective use of pupil gain criteria in measuring teacher effectiveness.

### Process Criteria

Process criteria pertain to teacher and student classroom behavior which are considered worthwhile in their own right. Biddle (1964) believed that such behaviors can be observed directly and studied objectively. Kleinman (1966:237) concluded from his historical review of related research that "measurement of behavior by observation appears to be the most promising technique to date for assessing teacher effectiveness."

Medley and Mitzel (1962) conducted research to discover patterns of classroom behavior characterized by effective teachers. They studied effectiveness through the study of emotional climate, subject matter or verbal emphasis of the teacher, social organization and classroom control. Medley and Mitzel (1962:320) concluded by saying:





Some behavior patterns effective in securing high ratings from supervisors, high pupil-teacher rapport, and a wholesome classroom atmosphere have been identified, but no progress has yet been made in finding behaviors effective in stimulating pupil growth.

In another article, Medley and Mitzel (1963:258) asserted:

Since it may be assumed that whatever effects a teacher has on pupils must result from his behaviors, it is only necessary to identify the crucial behaviors, record them, and score them properly to measure effectiveness in process.

Ryans (1960) conducted extensive research to determine what characteristics and behaviors identify effective teaching. His study focused on three dimensions of teacher behavior--warmth, organization and stimulation, and seven teacher characteristics--favorable opinion of students, favorable opinion of classroom procedures, favorable opinion of personnel, traditional versus child centered approach, verbal understanding, emotional stability, and validity of response. Turner and Fattu (1960b:19) outlines his strategy as consisting of:

(1) searching for relationships between classroom behaviors of the teacher and the concurrent and subsequent behaviors of pupils, (2) identifying the specific conditions under which a specific relationship between a pattern of teacher behavior and a pattern of pupil behavior occurs, and (3) demonstrating that a teacher with known characteristics will, in fact, engage in a particular set of classroom conditions.

Ryans concluded that knowledge of these characteristics and behaviors of teachers provides a basis for evaluating teachers.

As a result of their extensive research on teacher



evaluation, Turner and Fattu (1960) proposed that the best way to examine teacher behavior is by studying the teacher's ability to define and to resolve teaching problems and his ability to improve his problem-solving skills. They suggested that the establishing of teaching goals might be identified as problem-creating activity, and that a teacher's responses to actualize these goals might be identified as problem-solving activity. They also proposed that problem-solving skill, acquired through training and experience, can be measured by teacher performance in simulated teaching tasks.

Anderson and Hunka (1963) criticized the problem-solving theory because it is concerned with constructs rather than predictability, it is too strongly oriented towards teaching process, and it is applicable only in a covert rather than overt classroom situation.

Flanders (1961;1962) developed an interaction analysis system which gave some insights into sequential and predictable character of teacher-learner interaction. This system focused attention on the verbal participation of teachers and students in the classroom thereby providing the teacher with systematic information about his spontaneous behavior. Patterns of teacher verbal behavior were compared with pupil gain in achievement.

It was found that the attitudes of students toward the teacher and class were significantly more constructive in classrooms in which achievement was higher. The verbal patterns of teachers in the superior



classrooms were significantly different from those in below average classrooms. (Flanders, 1961:175)

He suggested that this approach has many implications for teachers and evaluators. However, Flanders (1969:1434), in his review of teacher effectiveness research, cautioned that "too little is known about classroom interaction. It would, therefore, be premature to advocate any particular approach to the conceptualizing of classroom teaching learning activities."

### Presage Criteria

Presage criteria, which assume predictive power and which include such teacher characteristics as personality, training, experience, intelligence and social skills, have been studied to determine a relationship between these attributes and teacher effectiveness. Bowers and Soar (1962:310) conducted research to study teacher personality and found support for their thesis that:

Teacher personality traits are important to the analysis of classroom interaction, and with the solution of certain methodological problems, personality traits can be used as covariants in studying classroom behavior.

Fattu (1962) and Flanders (1969) reviewed research studies pertaining to teacher presage criteria and teacher effectiveness. They observed that the presage criteria of intelligence, knowledge of subject matter, cultural background, socio-economic status, sex, and marital status had no significant relationship to teacher effectiveness.





Effective teaching was found to be related to teacher scholarship in college, professional preparation, age and experience, and attitude to teaching.

#### SUMMARY

An enormous amount of research has been conducted into teacher effectiveness since the turn of the century. The amount of research and opinion concerning this area has increased in recent years because of the increased emphasis on accountability and the quality of education. Yet, the literature available continually points to the problems associated with the evaluation of teachers.

The difficulty of evaluating teacher effectiveness arises from the problems associated with (1) defining good teaching, teacher effectiveness, and teacher competence; (2) studying human phenomena which are complex and which vary from situation to situation and from individual to individual; (3) investigating an area of study where little conclusive evidence has been provided by research studies; (4) maintaining objectivity when evaluation is carried out; and (5) determining the evaluative criteria and measurement techniques. These problems have caused teachers and researchers to question the validity and reliability of teacher evaluation.

Attempts to determine who should evaluate teachers are often frustrated by the contradictory research findings



and opinions. They range from external evaluators to students. On balance, however, it would appear that teachers should be evaluated by more than one person with the teacher's principal as one of the members of the evaluation group, and that the evaluators must have adequate training, preparation, and time for this task.

The most common methods of evaluation are rating scales and systematic observation. Although these methods have inherent strengths and weaknesses, the increased tendency to supplement these techniques with rigorous observer training and the use of audio-visual recorders has helped to eliminate some of the weaknesses.

The criteria on which teachers are to be evaluated are as numerous as the research studies which have attempted to establish them. The evaluative criteria may be classified as product (concerned with changes in students), process (concerned with the teaching process), or presage (concerned with teacher characteristics). Although there is no consensus as to which criteria category should receive the greatest weighting, it would appear that increased attention is being given to teacher characteristics and behavior, and to teacher-learner interaction.



## Chapter 3

### THE DESIGN OF THE STUDY

#### SYNOPSIS OF THE PROBLEM

Whatever the reasons for evaluating teacher effectiveness, teachers are evaluated by various personnel involved in education and on the basis of evaluation criteria determined by personnel external to the actual teaching situation. In this evaluation process, teachers are seldom consulted about the personnel who evaluate them, nor are they involved in determining the criteria on which they are evaluated although their personal welfare and professional development are at stake.

This study attempted to examine the views of teachers in an urban Saskatchewan school district, at one point in time, regarding (1) the existing and preferred evaluation personnel, and (2) the existing and preferred evaluation criteria. Through a survey of these views, the similarities and differences between the perceptions of existing and preferred personnel and criteria could be determined. The emphasis placed upon each of Mitzel's three categories of process, product, and presage criteria in the existing and preferred situation could also be established and a comparison of the emphasis placed upon these categories





could be made.

This study also attempted to identify any relationships which existed between existing and preferred personnel and personal and professional teacher variables such as level of instruction, age, sex, years of teaching experience, position held in the school, and years of post-secondary education.

Finally, this study sought to identify any relationships between existing and preferred criteria and the selected teacher variables listed above.

#### THE INSTRUMENT

The instrument, which is included in Appendix A, consisted of four sections:

- I. Personal and Professional Data Questionnaire
- II. Existing and Preferred Evaluators (Two parts)
- III. Existing and Preferred Evaluation Criteria (Two parts)
- IV. Comments on the Evaluation of Teachers and/or the Study.

Section I asked seven questions of teachers pertaining to the name of the school in which they taught, level of instruction, age, sex, length of teaching and/or administrative experience, position held in the school, and the years of post-secondary education.

A definition of evaluation followed Section I of the instrument (see Appendix A). The definition was given



to provide teachers with a common frame of reference when responding to the remainder of the instrument.

Section II consisted of two parts. The first of these parts related to existing evaluators. Teachers were asked to score the nine types of personnel which may be involved in evaluating teachers according to their perception of the extent to which each type of personnel is used in teacher evaluation. The second part related to preferred evaluators. Teachers were asked to score the nine types of personnel which may be involved in evaluating teachers according to the extent to which each type of personnel should be used in teacher evaluation.

The numerical scale on which evaluation personnel were to be scored was the same for both parts with the numbers signifying:

5. always used
4. frequently used
3. undecided about extent of use
2. seldom used
1. never used
0. do not know extent of use.

The types of evaluation personnel selected for inclusion in the Existing and Preferred Evaluators section of the instrument were drawn from the literature on the evaluation of teachers and from information received from colleagues.

Section III also consisted of two parts. On the



first of these parts, which related to existing evaluation criteria, teachers were asked to score thirty criteria which may be employed in teacher evaluation according to their perceptions of the importance that each criterion is given in teacher evaluation. On the second part, which related to preferred evaluation criteria, teachers were asked to score the same criteria according to the importance that should be given to each criterion in teacher evaluation.

The numerical scale on which the evaluative criteria were to be scored was the same for both parts with the numbers signifying:

- 5. very great importance
- 4. great importance
- 3. undecided about importance
- 2. little importance
- 1. no importance
- 0. do not know importance

The criteria of evaluation used in the Existing and Preferred Evaluation Criteria section of the instrument were prepared by Moore and used in his study. Moore (1966:30) stated:

This instrument contained a list of thirty criteria drawn from the literature on the evaluation of teachers. The criteria were selected for inclusion on the instrument after a pilot study had been carried out to isolate ten in each of the categories suggested by Mitzel; that is, Product, Process and Presage criteria.

The product, process and presage criteria grouped





by Moore according to Mitzel's categories (Appendix B) were listed alternately to prevent teacher bias in responding to the criteria in any one category.

Section IV of the instrument invited teachers to make any additional comments regarding the evaluation of teachers, the personnel employed for evaluation, or about the study itself.

## COLLECTION OF DATA

### Source of Data

The instrument was distributed to the 468 teachers in an urban Saskatchewan separate school district, whose superintendent had given approval for the study, to discover their perceptions of existing and preferred evaluation personnel and criteria at one point in time. On the assumption that personal contact would increase the percentage of instrument return, the co-operation and assistance of the principals was solicited. A brief explanation of the purpose and design of the study was given at a school system administrators' meeting at which central office personnel, principals and vice-principals were present. At this meeting a package of envelopes containing an instrument and a covering letter for each teacher in each school, as well as a covering letter to the principal, was distributed to each principal. The covering letters requested completion of the instrument and assured participants that individual responses would be treated in



confidence but that consolidated findings would not be subject to this condition. Principals were asked to distribute these envelopes to their teachers, to collect the completed instruments, to enclose them in the stamped, self-addressed envelope provided, and to forward them to the researcher.

After an elapsed time period of three weeks, follow-up letters were sent to the principals who had not forwarded the instruments from their schools.

A copy of the covering and follow-up letter to the principals, and a copy of the covering letter to the teachers is included in Appendix A.

All questionnaires returned were checked for internal consistency. Table 1 presents an analysis of returns. The high percentage of return (81.6) was seen as an indication of the interest of teachers in the personnel and criteria involved in evaluating teacher effectiveness.

Table 1

Classification of Responses to Questionnaires

Classification	Number	Percent
Returned and usable	347	74.1
Returned, but not usable	35	7.5
Not returned	86	18.4
Totals	468	100.0



## Personal and Professional Data

Table 2 presents information concerning the respondents. Since there were infrequent responses to some of the items, the data collected on this section of the instrument was collapsed into the categories indicated on the table. The number of teachers in each of the grade level categories was approximately equally distributed with the greater number of teachers (28.0%) in the grade 10-12 category and the lesser number of teachers (21.3%) in the grade 7-9 category. More than half the teachers (56.2%) were thirty years of age or younger; more than half (56.8%) were female; more than half (66.3%) had fewer than ten years teaching experience with the majority of these teachers falling into the 3-9 years experience category; more than half (55.3%) had completed four or more years of post-secondary education. The majority of teachers (85%) were classroom teachers holding no administrative position.

### Statistical Procedure

Data analysis was performed using the IBM 360/67 computer and programs documented by the Division of Educational Research at The University of Alberta.

In analyzing the data from Section II of the instrument, a frequency count was used to place evaluation personnel in rank order for the existing and preferred evaluation situation according to the percentage of "frequently" and "always" responses. This enabled the





Table 2

Personal and Professional Data  
(Frequencies by Percentages)  
N=347

Variable	Categories			
Level of instruction	K-3 27.4	4-6 23.3	7-9 21.3	10-12 28.0
Age	30 & under 56.2	31-40 23.1	41-50 12.7	51 & over 8.1
Sex	Male 43.2	Female 56.8		
Years of teaching experience	2 or less 18.2	3-9 48.1	10-19 20.7	20 or more 13.0
Years of post-secondary education	2 or less 32.0	3 12.7	4 23.3	5 24.2
Position held	Principal 6.6	Vice-principal 3.2	Department Head 5.2	Teacher 85.0



determination of teachers' perceptions of the extent to which each type of personnel is used and should be used in teacher evaluation.

The rank ordering of evaluators for the existing and preferred situation enabled comparisons to be made of the evaluative role of each type of personnel in each of the situations.

The Spearman rho correlation from ranks was calculated to determine whether or not any overall difference existed between the two different situations and the ranking of the evaluation personnel as perceived in the two situations.

Chi square tests were used to ascertain whether significant relationships existed according to specific categories of the six personal and professional data variables. An alpha level of .05 was used as the confidence level to indicate that significant relationships existed.

A similar statistical procedure was used for Section III of the instrument. The criteria were placed in rank order for both existing and preferred situations according to the percentage frequency of "great importance" and "very great importance" responses thereby enabling the determination of teachers' perceptions of the importance that each criterion is given and should be given in teacher evaluation.

The rank ordering of criteria used in evaluation for the existing and preferred situation enabled comparisons



to be made of the importance given to individual criteria in each of the two situations. A difference in rank of seven or more was arbitrarily selected as an indication of a substantial difference between the two situations.

The Spearman rho correlation from ranks was calculated to determine whether or not any overall difference existed between the two different evaluation situations and the ranking of all thirty criteria as perceived in the two situations.

When the thirty criteria, ranked according to frequency, were classified according to Mitzel's process, product, and presage categories, it was possible to compare the emphasis placed upon these criteria categories in each evaluation situation.

Chi square tests were used to ascertain whether any significant relationships existed according to specific categories of the six personal and professional data variables. An alpha level of .05 was used as the confidence level to indicate that significant relationships existed.

It was recognized that in some of the tables there was a probability that the chi square was inflated since the expected frequency in more than twenty percent of the cells was less than five. A separate computer program on collapsed responses was run to determine that the chi square was still significant but the data was presented in its original form to show the distribution of responses.

Comments regarding the study, invited in Section





IV of the instrument, were classified under the following headings:

1. General reaction to the instrument
2. Evaluation personnel
3. Evaluation criteria
4. Frequency of evaluation
5. General comments.

### LIMITATIONS AND DELIMITATION

#### Limitations

The limitations of this study were as follows:

1. This study was limited to the nine types of personnel who might fulfill the evaluation of teacher effectiveness function in Saskatchewan.
2. It was limited to the thirty evaluative criteria developed and tested by Moore (1966) and used by Thomas (1969) and Rogers (1970) in their studies of teacher evaluation. No attempt was made to alter or modify the criteria.
3. The findings of this study were limited to the population involved and generalizations to other school systems cannot be made.

#### Delimitation

This study was delimited to the perceptions of teachers, at one point in time, in the urban Saskatchewan school district selected for this study.



## Chapter 4

### EVALUATION PERSONNEL

One of the purposes of this study was to discover the perceptions of teachers in an urban Saskatchewan school district regarding the extent to which each of the nine types of personnel listed for scoring is used and should be used in the evaluation of teacher effectiveness, and to identify any existing relationships between these perceptions and the selected personal and professional variables.

#### PERCEPTIONS OF EXISTING AND PREFERRED EVALUATION PERSONNEL

##### Existing Evaluation Personnel

For this part of the instrument, teachers scored nine types of personnel which may be involved in evaluating teachers according to their perceptions of the extent to which each type of personnel is used in teacher evaluation. Each of the nine types of evaluators was scored on a six point numerical scale signifying: 5. always used; 4. frequently used; 3. undecided about extent of use; 2. seldom used; 1. never used; 0. do not know extent of use.

Table 3 ranks these types of personnel according to



their use, "frequently" and "always," in evaluating teachers. The majority of respondents perceived two of the nine types of evaluators to be "frequently" or "always" used in evaluating teacher effectiveness.

Table 3  
Frequency of Mention of Personnel  
Employed for Evaluating Teacher  
Effectiveness  
N=347

Rank	Personnel	Percentage Response		
		F <sup>a</sup>	A <sup>b</sup>	Total
1	School Board Superintendent	44.7	39.2	83.9
2	School Principal	44.7	30.0	74.7
3	Central Office Administrative Group	31.4	5.8	37.2
4	Department Head	15.0	4.3	19.3
5	Provincial Department of Education	13.5	1.7	15.2
6	Students	6.9	1.7	8.6
7	Self	5.8	1.2	7.0
8	Provincial Teachers' Organization	6.1	0.3	6.4
9	Colleagues	4.6	1.2	5.8

<sup>a</sup>Frequently used.

<sup>b</sup>Always used.

The School Board Superintendent ranked first; eighty-four percent of the respondents perceived him to be "frequently" or "always" used in evaluating teachers. The





second ranked evaluation personnel was the Principal who was perceived to be used "frequently" or "always" by seventy-five percent of the respondents. All other types of evaluators were perceived to be "never" or "seldom" used in evaluating teacher effectiveness by the majority of teachers.

#### Preferred Evaluation Personnel

For this part of the instrument, teachers scored nine types of evaluation personnel according to their perceptions of the extent to which each type of personnel should be used in teacher evaluation. Each of the nine types of personnel was scored on the same six point numerical scale indicated above.

Table 4 ranks these types of personnel according to their preferred "frequently" and "always" use in teacher evaluation. The majority of the respondents preferred two of the nine types of evaluators to be "frequently" or "always" used in evaluating teacher effectiveness.

The Principal ranked first among preferred evaluators, and was preferred to be "frequently" or "always" used by the majority (78.7%) of the respondents. The next ranked preferred evaluator was the Superintendent with fifty-eight percent of the teachers indicating that he should be "frequently" or "always" used in evaluating teachers. The majority of the teachers preferred the other types of



evaluators to be "never" or "seldom" used in evaluating teacher effectiveness.

Table 4  
Frequency of Mention of Personnel  
Preferred for Evaluating Teacher  
Effectiveness  
N=347

Rank	Personnel	Percentage Response		
		F <sup>a</sup>	A <sup>b</sup>	Total
1	School Principal	48.7	30.0	78.7
2	School Board Superintendent	45.0	12.7	57.7
3	Department Head	32.6	14.1	46.7
4	Self	30.8	10.4	41.2
5	Central Office Administrative Group	29.7	6.3	36.0
6	Colleagues	28.0	6.6	34.6
7	Students	23.9	6.3	30.2
8	Provincial Teachers' Organization	21.3	6.3	27.6
9	Provincial Department of Education	11.0	1.4	12.4

<sup>a</sup>Frequently used.

<sup>b</sup>Always used.

#### COMPARISONS OF EXISTING AND PREFERRED EVALUATORS

The rank ordering of evaluators for the existing and preferred evaluation situation enabled comparisons to be made of the evaluative role of each type of personnel in



each of the situations.

Table 5 presents the rank order of the evaluation personnel perceived to exist and preferred by teachers as well as the difference of their role in the existing and preferred situation. The highest ranked existing evaluator--the Superintendent--ranked second as preferred evaluator. The second ranked existing evaluator--the Principal--ranked first as preferred evaluator.

The greatest differences in rank pertained to the Provincial Department of Education Personnel, Self, and Colleagues. Teachers preferred to have Provincial Department of Education Personnel play a lesser role in evaluating teachers, but they preferred increased emphasis on Self-evaluation and evaluation by Colleagues.

The Spearman rho was calculated and was found to be .65. This value suggested that there was a positive correlation between the existing use of the listed evaluators and the preferred use of these evaluators; that is, the evaluation personnel perceived to play a major role in the existing situation tended to be perceived to play a major role in the preferred situation and, conversely, evaluation personnel perceived to play a minor role in the existing situation tended to be perceived to play a minor role in the preferred situation.





Table 5

Rank Order of Evaluation Personnel  
(As per tables 3 and 4)  
N=347

Personnel	Existing Evaluators		Preferred Evaluators		Differences in Ranks
	%	Rank	%	Rank	
School Board Superintendent	83.9	1	57.7	2	1
School Principal	74.7	2	78.7	1	1
Central Office Administrative Group	37.2	3	36.0	5	2
Department Head	19.3	4	46.7	3	1
Provincial Department of Education	15.2	5	12.4	9	4
Students	8.6	6	30.2	7	1
Self	7.0	7	41.2	4	3
Provincial Teachers' Organization	6.4	8	27.6	8	0
Colleagues	5.8	9	34.6	6	3



RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN CHARACTERISTICS OF  
RESPONDENTS AND THEIR PERCEPTIONS OF  
EXISTING EVALUATION PERSONNEL

One of the purposes of this study was to determine whether any significant relationships existed between teachers' perceptions of existing evaluation personnel and six personal and professional variables. The six variables were as follows: level of instruction; age; sex; years of teaching experience; position held; years of post-secondary education (see Appendix A).

Since there were infrequent responses to some of the response categories of the six variables, the data collected was collapsed into the following response categories: Level of instruction--all respondents in the "do not teach" category were high school teachers and were placed into the 10-12 category; Age--(1) 30 and under, (2) 31-40, (3) 41-50, (4) 51 and over; Years of teaching experience--(1) 2 or less, (2) 3-9, (3) 10-19, (4) 20 or more; Years of post-secondary education--(1) 2 or less, (2) 3, (3) 4, (4) 5, (5) 6 or more.

Since this study was interested in the perceptions of teachers who had knowledge or views regarding evaluation personnel, the "do not know" response category was omitted from statistical analyses.

A chi square test was performed to determine relationships between each of the six variables and the teachers' perceptions of evaluators. These relationships



were accepted as being significant at the .05 level or less. Significant relationships were found in fourteen instances and are presented in Tables 6-11.

### Level of Instruction

Table 6 shows that significant relationships existed between the level of instruction variable categories when responding to five types of personnel used in teacher evaluation. The five types of evaluation personnel were as follows: (1) Provincial Department of Education Personnel; (2) A group of Central Office Administrators and/or Supervisors; (3) Principal; (4) Department Head, Grade Co-ordinator, or Curricular Associate; (5) Students.

Grade 10-12 teachers more often perceived Provincial Department of Education personnel to be more frequently used as evaluators than did teachers at the other levels of instruction.

Teachers at the lower levels of instruction tended to perceive an Administrative Group to be used more frequently as evaluators than did teachers at the higher levels of instruction.

Grade 7-9 and 10-12 teachers more often indicated that the Principal was infrequently used in teacher evaluation than did teachers of the other grades.

Grade K-3 and 10-12 teachers tended to perceive Department Heads to be used more frequently in teacher evaluation than did teachers of the other grades, and





Table 6

Significant Relationships Between Level of Instruction  
and Perceived Use of Evaluation Personnel  
(Percentage by row)

Level of Instruction	Personnel	Response Categories				Chi Square	N
		Never	Seldom	Undecided	Frequently	Always	
K-3 4-6 7-9 10-12	Department of Education	34.3 32.6 35.0 15.1	38.6 30.2 38.3 47.7	10.0 25.6 11.7 5.8	15.7 11.6 15.0 25.6	1.4 0.0 0.0 5.8	259
K-3 4-6 7-9 10-12	Administrative Group	11.8 10.4 30.2 24.4	15.3 20.9 19.0 39.5	12.9 16.4 11.1 15.1	50.6 43.3 33.3 18.6	9.4 9.0 6.3 2.3	301
K-3 4-6 7-9 10-12	Principal	0.0 2.6 4.3 2.2	15.1 2.6 17.1 20.4	4.3 10.3 4.3 6.5	43.0 57.7 34.3 49.5	37.6 26.9 40.0 21.5	334

<sup>a</sup>Significant at the .01 level or less.



Table 6 (continued)

Level of Instruction	Personnel	Response Categories				Chi Square	N
		Never	Seldom	Undecided	Frequently	Always	
K-3	Department Head	22.4	16.4	29.2	23.9	7.5	33.6 <sup>a</sup>
4-6		50.0	10.4	20.8	12.5	6.2	
7-9		42.6	20.4	18.5	14.8	3.7	
10-12		24.5	36.2	10.6	23.4	5.3	
K-3	Students	82.8	14.9	1.1	1.1	0.0	52.6 <sup>a</sup>
4-6		79.2	9.7	6.9	1.4	2.8	
7-9		71.2	12.1	4.5	10.6	1.5	
10-12		44.0	33.0	3.3	16.5	3.3	

<sup>a</sup>Significant at the .01 level or less.



teachers at the lower levels of instruction tended to be more undecided about the role of Department Heads than the teachers at the higher levels of instruction.

Students were perceived to be more frequently used as evaluators at the higher levels of instruction than at the lower levels of instruction.

### Age

Table 7 shows that a significant relationship existed between the age of the respondents and one of the types of evaluation personnel listed, namely, the Provincial Department of Education Personnel.

Examination of the data indicated that older teachers tended to perceive Provincial Department of Education Personnel to be used more frequently in evaluating teacher effectiveness than did younger teachers.

### Sex

The three significant relationships between the sex of the respondents and perceived evaluators are presented in Table 8. The three types of evaluation personnel were the Superintendent, an Administrative Group, and Students.

Female teachers tended to perceive the Superintendent to be "always" used in teacher evaluation whereas male teachers tended to see the Superintendent to be "frequently" used.

Males tended to perceive an Administrative Group





Table 7

Significant Relationship Between Age of Respondents and Perceived  
Use of Evaluation Personnel  
(Percentage by rows)

Age	Personnel	Response Categories				Chi Square	N
		Never	Seldom	Undecided	Frequently	Always	
30 & under	Department	31.9	40.0	11.9	15.6	0.7	
31-40	of	21.5	44.6	15.4	16.9	1.5	
41-50	Education	31.6	31.6	5.3	28.9	2.6	24.2 <sup>b</sup> 259
51 & over		14.3	42.9	9.5	19.0	14.3	

<sup>b</sup>Significant at the .05 level or less.



Table 8

Significant Relationships Between Sex of Respondents and Perceived  
Use of Evaluation Personnel  
(Percentage by row)

Sex	Personnel	Response Categories				Chi Square	N
		Never	Seldom	Undecided	Frequently	Always	
Male	Superintendent	2.7	9.4	3.4	51.0	33.6	343
Female		0.0	10.3	4.6	40.7	44.3	
Male	Administrative Group	22.6	29.9	14.6	29.2	3.6	301
Female		15.9	19.5	13.4	42.1	9.1	
Male	Students	59.4	23.2	5.1	8.7	3.6	316
Female		75.3	14.6	2.8	6.7	0.6	

<sup>b</sup>Significant at the .05 level or less.



to be used infrequently as evaluators whereas females tended to see such a group to be frequently used.

Male teachers tended to perceive Students to be used more frequently in teacher evaluation than did female teachers.

#### Years of Teaching Experience

Table 9 presents the significant relationships between the years of teaching experience variable and perceptions of evaluation personnel. The two significant relationships pertained to personnel from the Provincial Department of Education and from the Provincial Teachers' Organization.

Provincial Department of Education Personnel were perceived to be used more frequently by teachers with more years of teaching experience than teachers with fewer years of teaching experience.

Teachers with twenty or more years of teaching experience more often indicated that Provincial Teachers' Organization Personnel were frequently used as evaluators than did teachers with less teaching experience.

#### Position Held

Significant relationships existed between the position held variable categories when responding to two types of personnel used in teacher evaluation, namely, an Administrative Group and Students. These relationships





Table 9

Significant Relationships Between Years of Teaching Experience  
and Perceived Use of Evaluation Personnel  
(Percentage by row)

Years of Experience	Personnel	Response Categories				Chi Square	N
		Never	Seldom	Undecided	Frequently	Always	
2 or less		48.7	23.1	17.9	10.3	0.0	
3-9	Department of	26.8	44.7	9.8	17.9	0.8	
10-19	Education	24.6	41.0	13.1	19.7	1.6	259
20 or more		13.9	41.7	8.3	25.0	11.1	
2 or less		53.7	24.4	17.1	4.9	0.0	
3-9	Teachers'	47.7	32.8	10.9	8.6	0.0	
10-19	Organization	31.1	54.1	8.2	6.6	0.0	260
20 or more		36.7	36.7	10.0	13.3	3.3	

<sup>a</sup>Significant at the .01 level or less.

<sup>b</sup>Significant at the .05 level or less.



are presented in Table 10.

Department Heads tended to perceive an Administrative Group to be used less frequently as evaluators than did teachers in other positions.

Principals tended to perceive Students to be never used in evaluation whereas teachers in other positions tended to perceive them to be used to some extent.

#### Years of Post-secondary Education

Table 11 shows that a significant relationship existed between the years of post-secondary education variable and teachers' response to Students as evaluators. The nature of the relationship was not clear, but it appeared that teachers with two or less years of post-secondary education tended to perceive Students to be used less frequently as evaluators than did teachers with more than two years of post-secondary education.

#### RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS AND THEIR PREFERRED USE OF EVALUATION PERSONNEL

This study attempted to determine whether significant relationships existed between teachers' preferred use of evaluation personnel and the six personal and professional variables.

Since infrequent responses were evidenced in some of the response categories of the six variables, the data was collapsed into the response categories indicated above.



Table 10

Significant Relationships Between Position Held and  
Perceived Use of Evaluation Personnel  
(Percentage by row)

Position Held	Personnel	Response Categories				Chi Square	N
		Never	Seldom	Undecided	Frequently	Always	
Principal		15.0	25.0	5.0	50.0	5.0	
Vice- principal	Administrative Group	0.0	54.5	0.0	45.5	0.0	301
Dep't. Head		17.6	52.9	11.8	17.6	0.0	
Teacher		20.2	20.9	15.4	36.0	7.5	
Principal		80.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	
Vice- principal	Students	40.0	50.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	316
Dep't Head		31.3	56.3	6.2	6.2	0.0	
Teacher		70.7	15.6	3.7	7.8	2.2	

<sup>b</sup>Significant at the .01 level or less.

<sup>a</sup>Significant at the .05 level or less.



Table 11

Significant Relationship Between Years of Post-Secondary Education  
and Perceived Use of Evaluation Personnel  
(Percentage by row)

Years of Education	Personnel	Response Categories				Chi Square	N
		Never	Seldom	Undecided	Frequently	Always	
2 or less		81.4	12.7	1.0	2.9	2.0	
3		75.0	12.5	2.5	10.0	0.0	
4	Students	64.9	20.3	8.1	4.1	2.7	316
5		53.8	24.4	5.1	14.1	2.6	
6 or more		59.1	27.3	0.0	13.6	0.0	

<sup>b</sup>Significant at the .05 level or less.





As in the previous section, the "do not know" response category was omitted from the statistical analyses.

A chi square test was performed to determine relationships between each of the six variables and teachers' perceptions of the preferred use of evaluators. These relationships were accepted as being significant at the .05 level or less. Significant relationships were found in fourteen instances and are presented in Tables 12-17.

### Level of Instruction

Table 12 shows that significant relationships existed between the level of instruction variable categories when teachers responded to six types of preferred evaluators. The six types of evaluators were as follows: (1) Provincial Department of Education Personnel; (2) Provincial Teachers' Organization Personnel; (3) an Administrative Group; (4) Department Heads; (5) Self-evaluation; (6) Students.

Grade 10-12 teachers tended to prefer Department of Education Personnel to be used more frequently as evaluators than teachers at the lower grade levels.

Teachers at the higher levels of instruction tended to prefer the Provincial Teachers' Organization Personnel to be used more frequently in teacher evaluation than did the teachers at the lower levels of instruction.

Grade K-3 teachers tended to prefer an Administrative Group to be used more frequently than teachers at other



Table 12

Significant Relationships Between Level of Instruction and Preferred Use of Evaluation Personnel  
(Percentage by row)

Level of Instruction	Personnel	Response Categories				Chi Square	N
		Never	Seldom	Undecided	Frequently	Always	
K-3	Department of Education	33.7	38.4	18.6	9.3	0.0	21.0 <sup>b</sup> 321
4-6		34.7	44.0	13.3	6.7	1.3	
7-9		47.1	23.5	13.2	14.7	1.5	
10-12		21.7	43.5	15.2	16.3	3.3	
K-3	Teachers' Organization	31.0	29.9	17.2	16.1	5.7	24.5 <sup>b</sup> 320
4-6		21.6	39.2	18.9	17.6	2.7	
7-9		29.0	17.4	21.7	26.1	5.8	
10-12		17.8	22.2	15.6	32.2	12.2	
K-3	Administrative Group	11.0	24.2	17.6	40.7	6.6	21.4 <sup>b</sup> 332
4-6		12.8	33.3	20.5	24.4	9.0	
7-9		14.3	38.6	15.7	28.6	2.9	
10-12		26.9	20.4	16.1	29.0	7.5	

<sup>b</sup>Significant at the .05 level or less.



Table 12 (continued)

Level of Instruction	Personnel	Response Categories					Chi Square	N
		Never	Seldom	Undecided	Frequently	Always		
K-3	Department Head	12.0	17.3	26.7	34.7	9.3	34.6 <sup>a</sup>	290
4-6		20.3	16.9	25.4	28.8	8.5		
7-9		15.0	6.7	13.3	48.3	16.7		
10-12		4.2	11.5	13.5	42.7	28.1		
K-3	Self	20.7	20.7	32.2	19.5	6.9	25.4 <sup>b</sup>	332
4-6		15.0	8.7	28.8	40.0	7.5		
7-9		14.1	21.1	14.1	35.2	15.5		
10-12		10.6	11.7	28.7	35.1	13.8		
K-3	Students	45.6	16.7	21.1	13.3	3.3	47.0 <sup>a</sup>	334
4-6		23.8	17.5	32.5	18.8	7.5		
7-9		20.3	29.0	20.3	27.5	2.9		
10-12		15.8	14.7	18.9	38.9	11.6		

<sup>a</sup>Significant at the .01 level or less.<sup>b</sup>Significant at the .05 level or less.





grade levels.

Teachers at the lower levels of instruction tended to prefer infrequent use of Department Heads as evaluators whereas teachers at the higher levels of instruction tended to prefer that they be frequently used.

K-3 teachers more often indicated a preference that Self-evaluation not be used than did teachers at the other levels of instruction.

Teachers at the higher levels of instruction tended to prefer greater use of Students as evaluators of teachers than did teachers at the lower levels of instruction.

### Age

Table 13 shows that a significant relationship existed between the age of the respondents and the preferred use of one of the types of personnel listed, namely, Provincial Teachers' Organization Personnel. Although the chi square was significant at the .05 level or less, the nature of the relationship between the age of the respondents and the preferred use of Provincial Teachers' Organization Personnel in the evaluation of teacher effectiveness was not discernable.

### Sex

The three significant relationships between sex and preferred evaluators are presented in Table 14. The three types of personnel were Department Heads, Self-evaluation,



Table 13

Significant Relationship Between Age of Respondents and Preferred Use of Evaluation Personnel  
(Percentage by row)

Age	Personnel	Response Categories				Chi Square	N
		Never	Seldom	Undecided	Frequently	Always	
30 & under	Teachers' Organization	22.3	23.9	22.3	25.0	6.5	
31-40		31.0	36.6	7.0	19.7	5.6	
41-50		26.2	16.7	16.7	26.2	14.3	320
51 & over		21.7	43.5	21.7	13.0	0.0	

<sup>b</sup>Significant at the .05 level or less.



Table 14

Significant Relationships Between Sex of Respondents and Preferred Use of Evaluation Personnel  
(Percentage by row)

Sex	Personnel	Response Categories				Chi Square	N
		Never	Seldom	Undecided	Frequently	Always	
Male	Department Head	8.3	13.5	12.8	45.9	19.5	290
Female		14.6	12.7	24.8	33.1	14.6	
Male	Self	11.6	18.5	21.2	32.9	15.8	332
Female		17.7	12.9	30.6	31.7	7.0	
Male	Students	17.1	17.1	21.9	33.6	10.3	334
Female		34.0	20.2	23.9	18.1	3.7	

<sup>b</sup>Significant at the .05 level or less.

<sup>a</sup>Significant at the .01 level or less.



and Students. In responding to each of the three types of evaluation personnel, male teachers tended to prefer Department Heads, Self-evaluation, and Students to be used more frequently in teacher evaluation than female teachers did.

#### Years of Teaching Experience

Table 15 presents the significant relationships between the years of teaching experience variable and teachers' preferred use of one of the evaluation personnel listed, namely, Provincial Department of Education Personnel. Teachers with two or less years of teaching experience tended to prefer that Provincial Department of Education Personnel never be used in evaluating teachers whereas teachers with more than two years of teaching experience tended to prefer some use of these evaluators.

#### Position Held

The significant relationship which existed between the position held variable categories when teachers responded to preferred use of Self-evaluation is shown in Table 16. Although this relationship was found to be significant, the nature of the relationship was not discernable.

#### Years of Post-secondary Education

Table 17 shows that significant relationships





Table 15

Significant Relationship Between Years of Teaching Experience  
and Preferred Use of Evaluation Personnel  
(Percentage by row)

Years of Experience	Personnel	Response Categories				Chi Square	N
		Never	Seldom	Undecided	Frequently	Always	
2 or less		46.3	27.8	14.8	9.3	1.9	
3-9	Department	34.8	33.5	17.1	13.9	0.6	
10-19	of Education	26.1	50.7	14.5	8.7	0.0	321
20 or more		22.5	47.5	10.0	12.5	7.5	

<sup>b</sup>Significant at the .05 level or less.



Table 16

Significant Relationship Between Position Held and  
Preferred Use of Evaluation Personnel  
(Percentage by row)

Position Held	Personnel	Response Categories				Chi Square	N
		Never	Seldom	Undecided	Frequently	Always	
Principal		0.0	33.3	14.3	33.3	19.0	
Vice- principal	Self	18.2	45.5	9.1	9.1	18.2	332
Dep't. Head		5.6	22.2	38.9	22.2	11.1	
Teacher		16.7	12.4	27.3	33.7	9.9	

<sup>b</sup>Significant at the .05 level or less.



Table 17

Significant Relationships Between Years of Post-Secondary Education  
and Preferred Use of Evaluation Personnel  
(Percentage by row)

Years of Education	Personnel	Response Categories				Chi Square	N
		Never	Seldom	Undecided	Frequently	Always	
2 or less		13.3	18.9	27.8	31.1	8.9	
3		23.5	14.7	5.9	35.3	20.6	
4	Department	7.7	7.7	20.0	41.5	23.1	290
5	Head	6.5	11.7	11.7	50.6	19.5	
6 or more		16.7	8.3	29.2	29.2	16.7	
2 or less		33.6	15.0	31.8	14.0	5.6	
3		37.2	20.9	9.3	25.6	7.0	
4	Students	19.7	25.0	21.1	27.6	6.6	334
5		16.9	16.9	19.3	39.8	7.2	
6 or more		32.0	20.0	28.0	12.0	8.0	

<sup>a</sup>Significant at the .01 level or less.





existed between the years of post-secondary education variable and teachers' response to use of Department Heads and Students as evaluators.

Teachers' preference for frequent use of Department Heads as evaluators tended to increase with an increase in the number of years of post-secondary education. The exception to this tendency was the teachers with six or more years of post-secondary education who tended to be more undecided about the preferred use of Department Heads as evaluators than the other teachers.

The relationship between years of post-secondary education and the preferred use of Students as evaluators was not clear.

#### SUMMARY

The majority of teachers perceived their School Board Superintendent and their Principal to be "frequently" or "always" used in evaluating teacher effectiveness. They also preferred that these personnel be used "frequently" or "always" in teacher evaluation. However, they preferred that the Principal be used more extensively as an evaluator than the Superintendent. The majority of teachers perceived the other personnel listed for scoring to be "never" or "seldom" used as evaluators, and preferred that they be used to this extent.

When a comparison of the evaluative role of the listed personnel in the existing and preferred situation was



made, no overall difference was found.

Fourteen significant relationships between the characteristics of the respondents and their perceptions of the existing use of evaluation personnel were found to exist. Five of these relationships pertained to the level of instruction variable. Fourteen significant relationships also existed between the characteristics of the respondents and their preferred use of evaluation personnel. Six of these relationships pertained to the level of instruction variable.



## Chapter 5

### EVALUATION CRITERIA

One of the purposes of this study was to discover (1) the perceptions of teachers in an urban Saskatchewan school district regarding the importance given to each of the thirty criteria listed for scoring in the existing evaluation situation, (2) the importance that each of these criteria should be given in the evaluation of teacher effectiveness, (3) the emphasis placed upon process, product and presage criteria in the existing and preferred situation, and (4) relationships between the selected personal and professional variables of the respondents and their perception of existing and preferred criteria.

#### PERCEPTIONS OF EXISTING AND PREFERRED EVALUATION CRITERIA

##### Existing Evaluation Criteria

For this part of the instrument, teachers scored thirty criteria which may be used in teacher evaluation according to their perceptions of the importance given to each criterion in the evaluation of teacher effectiveness. Each of the thirty criteria was scored on a six point numerical scale signifying: 5. very great importance; 4.



great importance; 3. undecided about importance; 2. little importance; 1. no importance; 0. do not know importance.

Table 18 ranks these criteria according to the "great" and "very great" importance given to them in teacher evaluation. Sixteen of the thirty criteria were perceived to be given "great" or "very great" importance by the majority of respondents.

The criterion Class Control ranked first; it was perceived to be given "great" or "very great" importance by eighty-four percent of the respondents. Ranking second was the criterion of Lesson Preparation and Planning (80.2%) and third was The Energy, Force and Enthusiasm Displayed in Teaching (72.4%). It was concluded that teachers perceived the present concept of an effective teacher to be one who has class control and well-prepared and well-planned lessons, and who displays energy, force and enthusiasm in teaching. The fourth ranked criterion was the teacher's Academic Qualifications and Knowledge of the Curriculum (66.6%); the fifth was the Methods of Lesson Presentation (66.2%); the sixth and seventh were Teacher-Pupil Relationships (63.1%) and Pupil Participation in Class (59.7%) respectively.

The existing criteria perceived to be given least importance were The Degree of Self-evaluation of the Processes Employed, The Teacher's Participation and Standing in the Community, and The Training of Pupils in Civic Competence and Responsibility which ranked thirtieth,





Table 18

Frequency of Mention of Criteria Employed in Evaluating Teachers  
N=347

Rank	Criteria	Percentage Response			Category <sup>c</sup>
		G <sup>a</sup>	V.G. <sup>b</sup>	Total	
1	Class control	56.2	28.0	84.2	Process
2	Lesson preparation and planning	57.1	23.1	80.2	Process
3	The energy, force and enthusiasm displayed in teaching	49.9	22.5	72.4	Process
4	Academic qualifications and knowledge of the curriculum	49.6	17.0	66.6	Presage
5	The methods of lesson presentation used	50.1	16.1	66.2	Process
6	Teacher-pupil relationships	46.4	16.7	63.1	Process
7	Pupil participation in class	49.0	10.7	59.7	Process
8	The loyalty and dependability of the teacher	45.2	13.3	58.5	Presage
9	The personality of the teacher	41.5	15.9	57.4	Presage
10	Concern with the all-round development of the pupils	38.9	17.6	56.5	Presage
11	Supervision and checking of written work	45.2	11.2	56.4	Process
12	Examination results	37.8	17.9	55.7	Product
13	The use of teaching aids	43.5	11.8	55.3	Process
14	Qualities of leadership displayed by the teacher	45.8	7.8	53.6	Presage

<sup>a</sup>Criterion given Great Importance.

<sup>b</sup>Criterion given Very Great Importance.

<sup>c</sup>Mitzel's criterion categories.



Table 18 (continued)

Rank	Criteria	Percentage Response			Category <sup>c</sup>
		G <sup>a</sup>	V.G. <sup>b</sup>	Total	
15	The dress and appearance of the teacher	45.8	7.5	53.3	Presage
16	The degree of co-operation by the teacher with other staff members	41.5	11.2	52.7	Presage
17	Concern with character development of the pupils	36.6	11.8	48.4	Product
18	The provision made for individual differences and group needs	35.4	9.8	45.2	Process
19	Pupil attitudes of courtesy, industry and self-reliance	34.3	7.8	42.1	Product
20	The level of intelligence of the teacher	34.9	6.6	41.5	Presage
21	The professional activities of the teacher	30.8	7.8	38.6	Presage
22.5	The training of pupils in self expression	31.1	6.9	38.0	Product
22.5	The teacher's standing with the pupils	30.5	7.5	38.0	Presage
24	The attitude of the pupils to the school and to authority	31.1	6.3	37.4	Product
25	The pupils' appreciation of moral and ethical standards	25.1	11.8	36.9	Product
26	The pupils work well without supervision	30.0	5.2	35.2	Product
27	The development of the process of individual enquiry in the pupils	28.2	5.5	33.7	Product

<sup>a</sup>Criterion given Great Importance.<sup>b</sup>Criterion given Very Great Importance.<sup>c</sup>Mitzel's criterion categories.



Table 18 (continued)

Rank	Criteria	Percentage Response			Category <sup>c</sup>
		G <sup>a</sup>	V.G. <sup>b</sup>	Total	
28	The training of pupils in civic competence and responsibility	21.3	6.1	27.4	Product
29	The teacher's participation and standing in the community	21.6	3.2	24.8	Presage
30	The degree of self-evaluation of the processes employed	17.9	3.5	21.4	Process

<sup>a</sup>Criterion given Great Importance.

<sup>b</sup>Criterion given Very Great Importance.

<sup>c</sup>Mitzel's criterion categories.





twenty-ninth, and twenty-eighth respectively.

### Preferred Evaluation Criteria

For this part of the instrument, teachers scored thirty criteria according to their perceptions of the importance that each criterion should be given in evaluation of teacher effectiveness. Each of the thirty criteria was scored on the same six point numerical scale indicated above.

Table 19 ranks these criteria according to their preferred "great" and "very great" importance given to them in teacher evaluation. The majority of respondents preferred that twenty-eight of the thirty criteria should be given "great" or "very great" importance.

The criterion Concern With the All-round Development of the Pupils ranked first; it was preferred as a criterion given "great" or "very great" importance by ninety-six percent of the respondents. Ranking second was the criterion of The Energy, Force and Enthusiasm Displayed in Teaching (95.1%) and third was Concern with Character Development of the Pupils (93.1%). It was concluded that the teachers perceived an effective teacher to be one who is concerned with the all-round development of the pupils, who displays energy, force and enthusiasm in teaching, and who is concerned with the character development of the pupils. The fourth ranked criterion was Teacher-pupil Relationships (91.6%); the fifth was Lesson Preparation and



Table 19  
Frequency of Mention of Criteria Preferred in Evaluating Teachers  
N=347

Rank	Criteria	Percentage Response			Category <sup>c</sup>
		G <sup>a</sup>	V.G. <sup>b</sup>	Total	
1	Concern with the all-round development of the pupils	37.5	58.5	96.0	Product
2	The energy, force and enthusiasm displayed in teaching	52.4	42.7	95.1	Process
3	Concern with character development of the pupils	49.6	43.5	93.1	Product
4	Teacher-pupil relationships	47.8	43.8	91.6	Process
5	Lesson preparation and planning	54.8	36.6	91.4	Process
6	The provision made for individual differences and group needs	53.9	36.3	90.2	Process
7	Class control	57.6	29.4	87.0	Process
8	The training of pupils in self-expression	58.2	28.0	86.2	Product
9	The degree of co-operation by the teacher with other staff members	59.1	24.8	83.9	Presage
11	Academic qualifications and knowledge of the curriculum	60.2	22.8	83.0	Presage
11	The development of the process of individual enquiry in the pupils	52.7	30.3	83.0	Product

<sup>a</sup>Criterion given Great Importance.

<sup>b</sup>Criterion given Very Great Importance.

<sup>c</sup>Mitxel's criterion categories.



Table 19 (continued)

Rank	Criteria	Percentage Response			Category <sup>c</sup>
		G <sup>a</sup>	V.G. <sup>b</sup>	Total	
11	The loyalty and dependability of the teacher	55.0	28.0	83.0	Presage
13	Pupil participation in class	53.6	26.5	80.1	Process
14	The personality of the teacher	50.1	28.8	78.9	Presage
15	Qualities of leadership displayed by the teacher	55.6	21.0	76.6	Presage
16	Pupil attitudes of courtesy, industry and self-reliance	50.7	24.8	75.5	Product
17	The methods of lesson presentation used	52.2	21.3	73.5	Process
18	The pupils appreciation of moral and ethical standards	47.8	25.1	72.9	Product
19	The training of pupils in civic competence and responsibility	48.1	22.5	70.6	Product
20	The use of teaching aids	51.3	15.9	67.2	Process
21	The teachers' standing with the pupils	47.0	19.9	66.9	Presage
22	Supervision and checking of written work	52.2	13.5	65.7	Process
23	The attitude of pupils to the school and to authority	46.4	17.3	63.7	Product
24	The pupils work well without supervision	45.8	13.8	59.6	Product
25	The level of intelligence of the teacher	44.1	12.7	56.8	Presage
26.5	The dress and appearance of the teacher	47.8	8.1	55.9	Presage

<sup>a</sup>Criterion given Great Importance.

<sup>b</sup>Criterion given Very Great Importance.

<sup>c</sup>Mitzel's criterion categories.





Table 19 (continued)

Rank	Criteria	Percentage Response			Category <sup>c</sup>
		G <sup>a</sup>	V.G. <sup>b</sup>	Total	
26.5	The degree of self-evaluation of the processes employed	43.8	12.1	55.9	Process
28	The professional activities of the teacher	40.3	10.4	50.7	Presage
29	The teacher's participation and standing in the community	22.8	5.8	28.6	Presage
30	Examination results	17.6	0.6	18.2	Product

<sup>a</sup>Criterion given Great Importance.

<sup>b</sup>Criterion given Very Great Importance.

<sup>c</sup>Mitzel's criterion categories.





Planning (91.4%); the sixth and seventh were The Provision Made for Individual Differences and Group Needs (90.2%) and Class Control (87.0%) respectively.

The criteria which teachers indicated should be given least importance were Examination Results, The Teacher's Participation and Standing in the Community, and The Professional Activities of the Teacher which ranked thirtieth, twenty-ninth, and twenty-eighth respectively.

#### COMPARISONS OF EXISTING AND PREFERRED CRITERIA

The rank ordering of criteria used in evaluation for the existing and preferred situation enabled comparisons to be made of the importance given to individual criteria in each of the two situations. A difference in rank of seven or more was arbitrarily selected as an indication of a substantial difference between the two situations.

Table 20 presents the rank order of the evaluation criteria perceived to exist and preferred by teachers as well as the difference in importance in the existing and preferred situation. The highest ranked existing criterion--Class Control--ranked seventh as a preferred criterion. The second ranked existing criterion ranked second in the preferred situation. The first ranked preferred criterion--Concern With the All-round Development of the Pupils--ranked tenth as an existing criterion. The second and third ranked preferred criteria, namely The



Table 20

Rank Order of Existing and Preferred Evaluation Criteria  
(As Per Tables 18 and 19)  
N=347

Criteria	Existing		Preferred		Difference in Ranks
	%	Rank	%	Rank	
Class control	84.2	1	87.0	7	6
Lesson preparation and planning	80.2	2	91.4	5	3
The energy, force and enthusiasm displayed in teaching	72.4	3	95.4	2	1
Academic qualifications and knowledge of the curriculum	66.6	4	83.0	11	7
The method of lesson presentation used	66.2	5	73.5	17	12
Teacher-pupil relationships	63.1	6	91.6	4	2
Pupil participation in class	59.7	7	80.1	13	6
The loyalty and dependability of the teacher	58.5	8	83.0	11	3
The personality of the teacher	57.4	9	78.9	14	5
Concern with the all-round development of the pupils	56.5	10	96.0	1	9
Supervision and checking of written work	56.4	11	65.7	22	11
Examination results	55.7	12	18.2	30	18
The use of teaching aids	55.3	13	67.2	20	7
Qualities of leadership displayed by the teacher	53.6	14	76.6	15	1
The dress and appearance of the teacher	53.3	15	55.9	26.5	11.5
The degree of co-operation by the teacher with other staff members	52.7	16	83.9	9	7
Concern with character development of the pupils	48.4	17	93.1	3	14
The provision made for individual differences and group needs	45.2	18	90.2	6	12



Table 20 (continued)

Criteria	Existing		Preferred		Difference in Rank
	%	Rank	%	Rank	
Pupil attitudes of courtesy, industry and self-reliance	42.1	19	75.5	16	3
The level of intelligence of the teacher	41.5	20	56.8	25	5
The professional activities of the teacher	38.6	21	50.7	28	7
The training of pupils in self expression	38.0	22.5	86.2	8	14.5
The teacher's standing with the pupils	37.4	22.5	66.9	21	1.5
The attitude of the pupils to the school and to authority	36.9	24	63.7	23	1
The pupil's appreciation of moral and ethical standards	36.9	25	72.9	18	7
The pupils work well without supervision	35.2	26	59.6	24	2
The development of the process of individual enquiry in the pupils	33.7	27	83.0	11	16
The training of pupils in civic competence and responsibility	27.4	28	70.6	19	9
The teacher's participation and standing in the community	24.8	29	28.6	29	0
The degree of self-evaluation of the processes employed	21.4	30	55.9	26.5	3.5





Energy, Force and Enthusiasm Displayed in Teaching and Concern With Character Development of the Pupils, ranked third and seventeenth respectively in the existing situation.

Of the five highest ranked criteria in the existing situation, only two were included among the first five listed in the preferred situation.

Substantial differences in rank between the existing and preferred evaluation criteria were identified for fifteen of the thirty criteria. The greatest difference in rank was the criterion Examination Results which ranked twelfth as an existing criterion and thirtieth as a preferred criterion. The second greatest difference in ranks was the criterion The Development of the Process of Individual Enquiry in the Pupil which had an existing rank of twenty-seven and a preferred rank of eleven. The third greatest difference was the criterion The Training of Pupils in Self Expression which ranked twenty-second as an existing criterion and eighth as a preferred criterion.

For the criteria which had a substantial difference in rank, the respondents desired decreased importance to be given to the criteria Academic Qualifications and Knowledge of the Curriculum, The Methods of Lesson Presentation Used, Supervision and Checking of Written Work, Examination Results, The Use of Teaching Aids, The Dress and Appearance of the Teacher, and The Professional Activities of the Teacher. They also desired that increased



importance be given to the criteria Concern With the All-round Development of the Pupils, The Degree of Co-operation by the Teacher With Other Staff Members, Concern With Character Development of the Pupils, The Provision Made for Individual Differences and Group Needs, The Training of Pupils in Self Expression, The Pupils' Appreciation of Moral and Ethical Standards, The Development of the Process of Individual Enquiry in the Pupils, and The Training of Pupils in Civic Competence and Responsibility.

#### Spearman Rho Calculation

The Spearman rho was calculated and was found to be .53. This value suggested that there was a positive correlation between the existing use of the listed criteria and the preferred use of these criteria; that is, the criteria perceived to be given great importance in the existing situation tended to be given great importance in the preferred situation and, conversely, evaluation criteria perceived to be given little importance in the existing situation tended to be perceived as being given little importance in the preferred situation.

#### Emphasis Placed Upon Categories of Criteria

An analysis of the emphasis which evaluators placed upon each of Mitzel's categories of process, product and presage criteria as perceived by the respondents to exist



when teachers are evaluated is presented in Table 21. This table was derived from Table 18 (p. 83) and is dependent upon the categorization of criteria presented in Appendix B.

Table 21

Rank Order of Criteria Perceived to be  
Employed in Evaluating Teachers  
Grouped According to Mitzel's  
Categories

Category	Rank as Per Table 18
Process	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 11, 13, 18, 30
Product	10, 12, 17, 19, 22.5, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28
Presage	4, 8, 9, 14, 15, 16, 20, 21, 22.5, 29

Analysis of Table 21 shows that the teachers perceived the greatest emphasis to be placed upon process criteria, and the least emphasis to be placed upon product criteria when evaluating teacher effectiveness. This finding coincides with that of Moore (1966), Thomas (1969), and Rogers (1970) who found that both inspectors and principals emphasized process criteria and de-emphasized product criteria in evaluating teachers.

Table 22 presents an analysis of the preferred emphasis to be placed upon the three different criteria categories in teacher evaluation. This table refers to Table 19 (p. 87) and to the grouping of criteria presented in Appendix B.





Teachers preferred the greatest emphasis to be placed upon process criteria and the least emphasis to be placed upon presage criteria. They also preferred product criteria to be given greater emphasis.

Table 22

Rank Order of Criteria Preferred to be  
Employed in Evaluating Teachers  
Grouped According to Mitzel's  
Categories

Category	Rank as Per Table 19
Process	2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 13, 17, 20, 22, 26.5
Product	1, 3, 8, 11, 16, 18, 19, 23, 24, 30
Presage	9, 11, 11, 14, 15, 21, 25, 26.5, 28, 29

It was concluded that process criteria were emphasized by evaluators and teachers in evaluating teacher effectiveness, and that teachers preferred an increased emphasis upon product criteria for evaluation.

#### RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS AND THEIR PERCEPTIONS OF EXISTING EVALUATION CRITERIA

One of the purposes of this study was to determine whether any significant relationships existed between teachers perceptions of existing evaluation criteria and six personal and professional variables. The six variables were as follows: level of instruction; age; sex; years of teaching experience; position held; years of post-secondary





education (see Appendix A).

Since there were infrequent responses to some of the response categories of the six variables, the data collected was collapsed into the following response categories: Level of instruction--all respondents in the "do not teach" category were high school teachers and were placed into the 10-12 category; Age--(1) 30 and under, (2) 31-40, (3) 41-50, (4) 51 and over; Years of experience--(1) 2 or less, (2) 3-9, (3) 10-19, (4) 20 or more; Years of post-secondary education--(1) 2 or less, (2) 3, (3) 4, (4) 5, (5) 6 or more.

Since this study was interested in the perceptions of teachers who had knowledge or views regarding evaluation criteria, the "do not know" response category was omitted from statistical analyses.

A chi square test was performed to determine relationships between each of the six variables and the teachers' perceptions of evaluation criteria. These relationships were accepted as being significant at the .05 level or less. Significant relationships were found in twenty-eight instances and are presented in Tables 23-28.

#### Level of Instruction

Table 23 shows that significant relationships existed between the level of instruction variable categories when teachers responded to three of the thirty criteria



Table 23

Significant Relationships Between Level of Instruction and Perceived Importance Given to Evaluation Criteria  
(Percentage by row)

Level of Instruction	Criteria	Response Categories				Chi Square	N
		No	Little	Undecided	Great	Very Great	
K-3 4-6 7-9 10-12	All-round development of pupils	0.0 1.4 4.2 8.3	22.3 16.2 21.1 31.3	10.6 21.6 15.5 12.5	36.2 45.9 42.3 38.5	30.9 14.9 16.9 9.4	32.8 <sup>a</sup> 335
K-3 4-6 7-9 10-12	Use of teaching aids	2.3 0.0 5.8 4.3	21.8 18.7 11.6 13.8	18.4 28.0 13.0 24.5	40.2 46.7 62.3 40.4	17.2 6.7 7.2 17.0	24.1 <sup>b</sup> 325
K-3 4-6 7-9 10-12	Provision for individual differences and group needs	5.5 2.6 6.9 13.8	24.2 17.9 20.8 31.9	18.7 20.5 27.8 20.2	37.4 50.0 31.9 28.7	14.3 9.0 12.5 5.3	23.8 <sup>b</sup> 335

<sup>a</sup>Significant at the .01 level or less.

<sup>b</sup>Significant at the .05 level or less.



listed for scoring.

Grade 10-12 teachers tended to perceive the All-round Development of Pupils criterion to be given little importance more often than did teachers of the other grades.

Teachers at the 7-9 level of instruction tended to perceive the Use of Teacher Aids criterion to be given greater importance than the teachers at the other levels of instruction did.

Teachers at the 10-12 level of instruction tended to perceive the Provision for Individual Differences and Group Needs criterion to be given lesser importance more often than did teachers at the other levels of instruction.

### Age

Table 24 shows that ten significant relationships existed between the age of the respondents and the evaluation criteria listed for scoring.

Teachers who were thirty years of age or younger tended to perceive the criterion of Teacher Dress and Appearance to be given lesser importance in teacher evaluation more often than did older teachers. The majority of the teachers in the 31-40 age category tended to perceive this criterion to be given greater importance than did the teachers in the other age categories.

The perceived importance given to the Teacher-Pupil Relationships, Development of the Process of Individual Enquiry in Pupils, Professional Activities of the Teacher,





Table 24

Significant Relationships Between Age of Respondents and Perceived Importance Given to Evaluation Criteria  
(Percentage by row)

Age	Criteria	Response Categories					Chi Square	N
		No	Little	Undecided	Great	Very Great		
30 & under 31-40 41-50 51 & over	Teacher dress and appearance	2.1 3.8 4.5 0.0	23.3 11.5 13.6 7.7	24.9 17.9 27.3 34.6	44.4 60.3 40.9 38.5	5.3 6.4 13.6 19.2	23.2 <sup>b</sup>	337
30 & under 31-40 41-50 51 & over	Teacher-pupil relationships	2.7 6.2 0.0 0.0	19.5 13.7 11.9 4.0	16.2 12.5 19.0 8.0	48.6 52.5 35.7 56.0	13.0 15.0 33.3 32.0	24.4 <sup>b</sup>	332
30 & under 31-40 41-50 51 & over	Development of individual enquiry in pupils	2.7 7.6 2.4 0.0	35.2 25.3 24.4 8.7	28.6 34.2 34.1 30.4	26.4 32.9 36.6 39.1	7.1 0.0 2.4 21.7	29.8 <sup>a</sup>	325

<sup>b</sup>Significant at the .05 level or less.

<sup>a</sup>Significant at the .01 level or less.



Table 24 (continued)

Age	Criteria	Response Categories					Chi Square	N
		No	Little	Undecided	Great	Very Great		
30 & under 31-40 41-50 51 & over	Professional activities of the teacher	11.2 5.1 2.5 4.0	25.3 15.4 22.5 0.0	26.4 41.0 17.5 36.0	28.7 32.1 50.0 44.0	8.4 6.4 7.5 16.0	27.1 <sup>a</sup>	321
30 & under 31-40 41-50 51 & over	Training pupils in civic competence and responsibility	8.8 6.5 7.1 4.2	36.8 24.7 28.6 8.3	28.6 42.9 26.2 37.5	20.9 23.4 26.2 29.2	4.9 2.6 11.9 20.8	25.0 <sup>b</sup>	325
30 & under 31-40 41-50 51 & over	Pupil attitudes of courtesy, industry and self-reliance	3.8 8.9 9.5 4.2	26.8 20.3 26.2 12.5	27.3 29.1 11.9 25.0	35.0 38.0 40.5 33.3	7.1 3.8 11.9 25.0	21.2 <sup>b</sup>	328
30 & under 31-40 41-50 51 & over	Provision for individual differences and group needs	9.6 2.6 9.3 3.7	26.2 25.6 23.3 7.4	16.6 32.1 14.0 37.0	36.9 37.2 34.9 37.0	10.7 2.6 18.6 14.8	26.4 <sup>a</sup>	335

<sup>a</sup>Significant at the .01 level or less.<sup>b</sup>Significant at the .05 level or less.



Table 24 (continued)

Age	Criteria	Response Categories					Chi Square	N
		No	Little	Undecided	Great	Very Great		
30 & under	Pupil attitudes to school and authority	11.8	27.5	21.9	33.1	5.6	31.4 <sup>a</sup>	324
31-40		11.4	21.5	35.4	26.6	5.1		
41-50		18.6	9.3	7.0	55.8	9.3		
51 & over		8.3	29.2	29.2	16.7	16.7		
30 & under	Degree of self-evaluation of processes	19.1	25.3	34.0	17.9	3.7	25.4 <sup>b</sup>	291
31-40		17.1	22.9	40.0	20.0	0.0		
41-50		7.7	12.8	41.0	28.2	10.3		
51 & over		5.0	0.0	45.0	40.0	10.0		
30 & under	Teacher's standing with pupils	8.3	32.2	25.6	27.8	6.1	25.4 <sup>b</sup>	323
31-40		9.2	19.7	23.7	43.4	3.9		
41-50		4.9	14.6	26.8	39.0	14.6		
51 & over		0.0	26.9	23.1	26.9	23.1		

<sup>a</sup>Significant at the .01 level or less.<sup>b</sup>Significant at the .05 level or less.



Training of Pupils in Civic Competence and Responsibility, and Pupil Attitudes of Courtesy, Industry and Self-reliance criteria tended to increase with the increase in the age of the respondents.

The nature of the relationship between the age variable and teachers' perceptions of the importance given to the Provision for Individual Differences and Group Needs evaluation criterion was not discernable.

The majority of teachers in the 41-50 age category more often perceived Pupil Attitudes to School and Authority to be an important evaluation criterion than did teachers in the other age categories.

Teachers' perceptions of the importance given to The Degree of Self-evaluation of the Processes Involved and to the Teacher's Standing With Pupils criteria tended to increase with an increase in age.

### Sex

The three significant relationships between the sex of the respondents and their perceptions of the importance given to evaluative criteria are presented in Table 25.

Female teachers tended to perceive the criterion of Pupil Class Participation to be given great importance more often than male teachers did.

Male teachers tended to perceive the Professional Activities of the Teacher criterion to be given greater importance more often than did female teachers.





Table 25

Significant Relationships Between Sex of Respondents and Perceived Importance Given to Evaluation Criteria  
(Percentage by row)

Sex	Criteria	Response Categories				Chi Square	N
		No	Little	Undecided	Great	Very Great	
Male	Pupil class participation	4.9	16.0	21.5	47.9	9.7	10.3 <sup>b</sup> 334
Female		0.0	15.3	19.5	53.2	12.1	
Male	Professional activities	7.7	24.5	21.7	39.9	6.3	12.1 <sup>b</sup> 321
Female		8.4	17.4	36.0	28.1	10.1	
Male	Student attitude to school and authority	11.1	23.6	29.9	32.6	2.8	10.6 <sup>b</sup> 324
Female		13.3	23.9	18.9	33.9	10.0	

<sup>b</sup>Significant at the .05 level or less.



Female teachers tended to perceive the Student Attitudes to School and to Authority criterion to be given greater importance than male teachers did.

#### Years of Teaching Experience

The significant relationships between the years of experience variable and teachers' perceptions of evaluative criteria are shown in Table 26. The relationships pertained to three criteria, namely, All-round Development of the Pupils, Professional Activities of the Teacher, and Teacher-Pupil Relationships. In all three instances, teachers' perceptions of the importance given to these criteria tended to increase with an increase in the number of years of teaching experience.

#### Position Held

Seven significant relationships existed between the position held variable and teacher's perceptions of the importance given to evaluative criteria. These relationships are presented in Table 27.

Principals tended to perceive the All-round Development of Pupils criterion to be given great importance whereas Department Heads tended to perceive this criterion to be given little importance.

Department Heads tended to perceive the Examination Results criterion to be given great importance more often than teachers in other positions.



Table 26

Significant Relationships Between Years of Teaching Experience and Perceived Importance Given to Evaluation Criteria  
(Percentage by row)

Years of Experience	Criteria	Response Categories					Chi Square	N
		No	Little	Undecided	Great	Very Great		
2 or less	All-round pupil development	5.0	28.3	6.7	40.0	20.0	22.1 <sup>b</sup>	335
3-9		1.9	29.4	16.2	34.4	18.1		
10-19		4.2	14.1	16.9	52.1	12.7		
20 or more		6.8	9.1	15.9	43.2	25.0		
2 or less	Professional activities	13.0	20.4	24.1	27.8	14.8	22.0 <sup>b</sup>	321
3-9		9.6	25.6	30.8	26.9	7.1		
10-19		2.9	15.7	32.9	42.9	5.7		
20 or more		4.9	9.8	26.8	48.8	9.8		
2 or less	Teacher-pupil relationship	12.5	25.0	30.4	25.0	7.1	29.1 <sup>a</sup>	323
3-9		7.7	33.3	25.0	28.2	5.8		
10-19		4.3	15.9	24.6	49.3	5.8		
20 or more		4.8	21.4	19.0	33.3	21.4		

<sup>b</sup>Significant at the .05 level or less.

<sup>a</sup>Significant at the .01 level or less.





Table 27

Significant Relationships Between Position Held and Perceived Importance Given to Evaluation Criteria  
(Percentage by row)

Position Held	Criteria	Response Categories					Chi Square	N
		No	Little	Undecided	Great	Very Great		
Principal Vice-Principal	All-round pupil development	0.0	17.4	4.3	65.2	13.0	53.7 <sup>a</sup>	335
Dep't. Head Teacher		0.0	27.3	9.1	63.6	0.0		
		27.8	27.8	33.3	11.1	0.0		
		2.5	23.3	14.5	39.2	20.5		
Principal Vice-Principal	Examination results	4.5	40.9	9.1	45.5	0.0	27.1 <sup>a</sup>	330
Dep't. Head Teacher		0.0	18.2	36.4	45.5	0.0		
		0.0	5.6	11.1	72.7	11.1		
		2.9	16.1	22.6	36.9	21.5		
Principal Vice-Principal	Teaching energy and enthusiasm	0.0	0.0	4.3	43.5	52.2	21.2 <sup>b</sup>	341
Dep't. Head Teacher		0.0	18.2	0.0	54.5	27.3		
		0.0	22.2	22.2	50.0	5.6		
		1.7	12.1	13.5	51.2	21.5		

<sup>a</sup>Significant at the .01 level or less.

<sup>b</sup>Significant at the .05 level or less.



Table 27 (continued)

Position Held	Criteria	Response Categories				Chi Square	N
		No	Little	Undecided	Great	Very Great	
Principal Vice-		4.3	8.7	8.7	73.9	4.3	
Principal	Supervision of	0.0	54.5	9.1	36.4	0.0	23.4 <sup>b</sup>
Dep't. Head	written work	0.0	16.7	33.3	50.0	0.0	325
Teacher		2.6	17.2	19.8	46.5	13.9	
Principal Vice-		8.7	13.0	21.7	56.5	0.0	
Principal	Pupil attitudes	27.3	36.4	9.1	27.3	0.0	23.0 <sup>b</sup>
Dep't. Head	of courtesy,	11.1	27.8	33.3	27.8	0.0	328
Teacher	industry and self-reliance	4.3	24.3	26.1	35.5	9.8	
Principal Vice-		0.0	13.0	8.7	47.8	30.4	
Principal	Leadership	0.0	18.2	0.0	72.7	9.1	26.3 <sup>a</sup>
Dep't. Head	qualities	11.1	22.2	16.7	44.4	5.6	332
Teacher		3.6	18.9	23.9	47.1	6.4	

<sup>b</sup>Significant at the .05 level or less.<sup>a</sup>Significant at the .01 level or less.



Table 27 (continued)

Position Held	Criteria	Response Categories				Chi Square	N
		No	Little	Undecided	Great	Very Great	
Principal		0.0	39.1	21.7	34.8	4.3	
Vice-	Pupil						
Principal	self-expression	0.0	63.6	18.2	18.2	0.0	323
Dep't. Head		17.6	5.9	52.9	23.5	0.0	
Teacher		6.6	23.2	27.2	34.6	8.5	

<sup>b</sup>Significant at the .05 level or less.



Principals more often perceived Teaching Energy and Enthusiasm and Supervision of Written Work to be important evaluative criteria than did teachers holding other positions.

Vice-principals tended to perceive the Pupil Attitudes of Courtesy, Industry and Self-reliance criterion to be given little importance more often than the other teachers did.

Principals and Vice-principals tended to perceive the Leadership Qualities criterion to be given great importance more often than other teachers did.

Vice-principals tended to perceive the Pupil Self-expression criterion to be given little importance more often than other teachers did.

#### Years of Post-secondary Education

Table 28 shows that significant relationships existed between the years of post-secondary education variable and perceptions of the importance given to the All-round Development of Pupils and Teacher Co-operation with Staff criteria. In both instances the nature of the relationship was not clear.

#### RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS AND THEIR PREFERRED USE OF EVALUATION CRITERIA

This study attempted to determine whether significant relationships existed between teachers'





Table 28

Significant Relationships Between Years of Post-Secondary Education  
and Perceived Importance Given to Evaluation Criteria  
(Percentage by row)

Years of Education	Criteria	Response Categories					Chi Square	N
		No	Little	Undecided	Great	Very Great		
2 or less	All-round pupil development	0.9	20.6	14.0	40.2	24.3	27.7 <sup>b</sup>	335
3		2.4	31.0	9.5	31.0	26.2		
4		2.6	21.8	12.8	46.2	16.7		
5		7.4	27.2	13.6	43.2	8.6		
6 or more		7.4	14.8	33.3	29.6	14.8		
2 or less	Teacher co-operation with staff	4.7	19.6	20.6	42.1	13.1	34.8 <sup>a</sup>	330
3		4.9	19.5	29.3	31.7	14.6		
4		4.0	9.3	25.3	50.7	10.7		
5		3.7	30.9	6.2	45.7	13.6		
6 or more		11.5	7.7	38.5	42.3	0.0		

<sup>b</sup>Significant at the .05 level or less.

<sup>a</sup>Significant at the .01 level or less.



preference for the importance given to evaluation criteria and the six personal and professional variables mentioned above.

The same collapsed response categories of the six variables indicated in the above section were used in the statistical analyses, and the "do not know" response category was also omitted from the statistical analyses.

A chi square test was performed to determine relationships between each of the six variables and teachers' perceptions of the preferred importance given to evaluation criteria. These relationships were accepted at the .05 level or less. Significant relationships were found in twenty instances and are presented in Tables 29-33.

#### Level of Instruction

Table 29 shows that three significant relationships existed between the level of instruction variable and teachers' preference for the importance given to evaluative criteria.

The nature of the relationship between the levels of instruction and the preferred importance of the Examination Results criterion was not clear, but teachers at the lower levels tended to be more uncertain about the importance that this criterion should be given than were the teachers at the higher levels.

Teachers at the higher level of instruction tended to prefer that the Development of Individual Enquiry in



Table 29

Significant Relationships Between Level of Instruction and Preferred Importance Given to Evaluation Criteria  
(Percentage by row)

Level of Instruction	Criteria	Response Categories				Chi Square	N
		No	Little	Undecided	Great	Very Great	
K-3	Examination results	8.4	46.3	35.8	9.5	0.0	45.4 <sup>a</sup> 342
4-6		3.8	54.4	35.4	6.3	0.0	
7-9		9.7	38.9	29.2	19.4	2.8	
10-12		10.4	38.5	16.7	34.4	0.0	
K-3	Development of individual enquiry in pupils	0.0	4.3	18.1	50.0	27.7	22.2 <sup>b</sup> 344
4-6		1.2	4.9	18.5	50.6	24.7	
7-9		0.0	0.0	6.9	51.4	41.7	
10-12		0.0	0.0	10.3	59.8	29.9	
K-3	Professional activities	5.5	16.5	26.4	40.7	11.0	23.5 <sup>b</sup> 340
4-6		6.3	21.5	40.5	24.1	7.6	
7-9		4.1	17.6	18.9	51.4	8.1	
10-12		3.1	16.7	17.7	47.9	14.6	

<sup>a</sup>Significant at the .01 level or less.

<sup>b</sup>Significant at the .05 level or less.





Pupils criterion be given greater importance than did teachers at the lower levels of instruction.

Grade 4-6 teachers tended to prefer that the Professional Activities of the Teacher criterion be given less importance than did teachers of the other grades.

### Age

Table 30 shows that five significant relationships existed between the age of the respondents and the preferred importance given to evaluation criteria.

Teachers who were fifty-one years of age or older tended to prefer Teacher Appearance and Dress to be given greater importance as an evaluative criterion than younger teachers did. Teachers thirty years of age or younger most often indicated a preference for little importance to be given to this criterion.

Teacher preference for Academic Qualifications and Knowledge of the Curriculum, Teacher Intelligence, and Professional Activities of the Teacher as important evaluative criteria tended to increase with an increase in age.

The nature of the relationship between the sex of the respondents variable and the preferred importance given to the Teacher Personality criterion was not discernable.

### Sex

Four significant relationships existed between the sex variable and the preferred importance given to



Table 30

Significant Relationships Between Age of Respondents and Preferred Importance Given to Evaluation Criteria  
(Percentage by row)

Age	Criteria	Response Categories					Chi Square	N
		No	Little	Undecided	Great	Very Great		
30 & under 31-40 41-50 51 & over	Teacher appearance and dress	2.6 0.0 0.0 0.0	27.7 19.0 25.6 3.6	22.1 16.5 11.6 14.3	42.1 57.0 53.5 57.1	5.6 7.6 9.3 25.0	28.5 <sup>a</sup>	345
30 & under 31-40 41-50 51 & over	Academic qualifications	0.5 0.0 0.0 0.0	7.7 3.7 0.0 0.0	12.9 12.5 9.1 0.0	62.9 51.2 68.2 57.1	16.0 32.5 22.7 42.9	25.1 <sup>b</sup>	346
30 & under 31-40 41-50 51 & over	Teacher intelligence	3.8 1.3 0.0 0.0	13.0 10.1 7.1 3.6	30.8 26.6 28.6 10.7	43.2 50.6 45.2 50.0	9.2 11.4 19.0 35.7	25.0 <sup>b</sup>	334

<sup>a</sup>Significant at the .01 level or less.

<sup>b</sup>Significant at the .05 level or less.



Table 30 (continued)

Age	Criteria	Response Categories					
		No	Little	Undecided	Great	Very Great	Square N
30 & under 31-40 41-50 51 & over	Professional activities	6.3 1.3 4.7 3.6	20.5 16.5 16.3 7.1	28.9 30.4 14.0 7.1	34.7 46.8 46.5 60.7	9.5 5.1 18.6 21.4	27.0 <sup>a</sup> 340
30 & under 31-40 41-50 51 & over	Participation in community	18.5 10.1 7.0 7.1	31.7 24.1 20.9 3.6	27.5 29.1 44.2 32.1	15.3 34.2 23.3 46.4	6.9 2.5 4.7 10.7	36.1 <sup>a</sup> 339

<sup>a</sup>Significant at the .01 level or less.



evaluative criteria. These relationships are shown in Table 31.

The nature of the relationship between the sex of the respondents variable and the preferred importance given to the Teacher Personality criterion was not discernable.

More female teachers than male teachers tended to prefer Use of Teaching Aids as an important evaluative criterion.

More male teachers than female teachers tended to prefer Leadership Qualities and Participation in the Community as important evaluative criteria.

#### Years of Teaching Experience

Table 32 presents the significant relationships between the years of teaching experience variable and teachers' preferred importance given to evaluation criteria. Three significant relationships were found to exist.

More teachers with two or less years of teaching experience tended to prefer that little importance be given to the Method of Lesson Presentation criterion than did teachers with more than two years of teaching experience.

The preference for greater importance given to Teacher Participation in the Community as an evaluative criterion tended to increase with an increase in the number of years of teaching experience.





Table 31

Significant Relationships Between Sex of Respondents and Preferred Importance Given to Evaluation Criteria  
(Percentage by row)

Sex	Criteria	Response Categories					Chi Square	N
		No	Little	Undecided	Great	Very Great		
Male	Teacher personality	1.3	7.4	10.1	45.6	35.6	10.1 <sup>b</sup>	345
Female		0.0	6.1	15.8	54.1	24.0		
Male	Use of teaching aids	4.8	13.6	19.0	50.3	12.2	10.0 <sup>b</sup>	342
Female		0.5	10.3	16.9	53.3	19.0		
Male	Leadership qualities	0.0	4.0	12.1	55.7	28.2	14.5 <sup>a</sup>	346
Female		2.0	10.2	16.2	55.8	15.7		
Male	Participation in community	10.7	22.1	29.5	28.9	8.7	11.1 <sup>b</sup>	339
Female		16.8	29.5	31.1	18.9	3.7		

<sup>b</sup>Significant at the .05 level or less.

<sup>a</sup>Significant at the .01 level or less.



Table 32

Significant Relationships Between Years of Teaching Experience and Preferred Importance Given to Evaluation Criteria  
(Percentage by row)

Years of Experience	Criteria	Response Categories					Chi Square	N
		No	Little	Undecided	Great	Very Great		
2 or less 3-9 10-19 20 or more	Lesson presentation	7.9 0.6 1.4 0.0	9.5 12.6 9.7 8.9	20.6 10.8 11.1 17.8	41.3 56.3 56.9 44.4	20.6 19.8 20.8 28.9	22.9 <sup>b</sup>	347
2 or less 3-9 10-19 20 or more	Participation in community	23.0 17.3 4.2 6.8	29.5 29.6 25.0 11.4	24.6 28.4 33.3 40.9	14.8 17.9 33.3 38.6	8.2 6.8 4.2 2.3	32.2 <sup>a</sup>	339
2 or less 3-9 10-19 20 or more	Self-evaluation of processes	1.7 0.0 1.6 4.9	12.1 2.0 4.7 9.8	31.0 37.3 21.9 24.4	41.4 46.0 62.5 46.3	13.8 14.7 9.4 14.6	24.3 <sup>b</sup>	313

<sup>b</sup>Significant at the .05 level or less.

<sup>a</sup>Significant at the .01 level or less.



The nature of the relationship between the years of experience variable and preferred importance given to the Self-evaluation of the Processes Involved criterion was not clear.

#### Position Held

No significant relationships between the position held variable and teachers' preference for the importance given to evaluative criterion listed were evident.

#### Years of Post-secondary Education

Table 33 shows that five significant relationships existed between the years of post-secondary education variable and teachers' responses to the preferred importance given to evaluation criteria.

Teacher preference for the importance that should be given to the use of Examination Results and Academic Qualifications and Knowledge of the Curriculum as evaluative criteria tended to increase with an increase in the number of years of post-secondary education.

The nature of the relationships between the years of post-secondary education variable and the preferred importance given to Development of Individual Enquiry in Pupils, Leadership Qualities, and Participation in the Community criteria were not clear.





Table 33

Significant Relationships Between Years of Post-Secondary Education  
and Preferred Importance Given to Evaluation Criteria  
(Percentage by row)

Years of Education	Criteria	Response Categories					Chi Square	N
		No	Little	Undecided	Great	Very Great		
2 or less	Examination results	4.5	48.2	35.5	11.8	0.0	32.6 <sup>a</sup>	342
3		7.0	53.5	32.6	4.7	2.3		
4		12.5	42.5	26.2	18.8	0.0		
5		7.3	42.7	24.4	24.4	1.2		
6 or more		14.8	25.9	18.5	40.7	0.0		
2 or less	Academic qualifications	0.0	8.1	14.4	65.8	11.7	41.0 <sup>a</sup>	346
3		2.3	4.5	20.5	56.8	15.9		
4		0.0	4.9	9.9	63.0	22.2		
5		0.0	1.2	7.2	57.8	33.7		
6 or more		0.0	7.4	0.0	44.4	48.1		
2 or less	Development of individual enquiry in pupils	0.0	6.3	10.8	55.9	27.0	33.0 <sup>a</sup>	344
3		2.4	0.0	19.5	43.9	34.1		
4		0.0	0.0	21.0	50.6	28.4		
5		0.0	0.0	6.0	56.0	38.1		
6 or more		0.0	3.7	18.5	55.6	22.2		

<sup>a</sup>Significant at the .01 level or less.



Table 33 (continued)

Years of Education	Criteria	Response Categories				Chi Square	N
		No	Little	Undecided	Great	Very Great	
2 or less	Leadership qualities	0.9	11.7	11.7	59.5	16.2	
3		4.7	11.6	20.9	48.8	14.0	
4		0.0	2.5	17.3	61.7	18.5	31.6 <sup>b</sup>
5		1.2	6.0	9.5	47.6	35.7	346
6 or more		0.0	3.7	22.2	59.3	14.8	
2 or less	Participation in community	16.5	33.0	28.4	17.4	4.6	
3		20.5	31.8	31.8	11.4	4.5	
4		15.8	18.4	34.2	27.6	3.9	28.8 <sup>b</sup>
5		9.5	27.4	22.6	31.0	9.5	339
6 or more		3.8	7.7	50.0	30.8	7.7	

<sup>b</sup>Significant at the .05 level or less.



## SUMMARY

The majority of respondents perceived sixteen of the thirty criteria listed for scoring to be given "great" or "very great" importance in the existing evaluation situation. According to their perceptions, the criteria which were given the greatest importance were Class Control, Lesson Preparation and Planning, and The Energy, Force and Enthusiasm Displayed in Teaching.

The majority of respondents preferred that twenty-eight of the thirty criteria be given "great" or "very great" importance with the greatest importance to be given to Concern With the All-round Development of the Pupils, The Energy, Force and Enthusiasm Displayed in Teaching, and Concern With the Character Development of the Pupils criteria.

When a comparison of the extent to which each of the evaluative criteria is used or should be used was made, substantial differences were identified for fifteen of the thirty criteria. However, the Spearman rho calculation showed that no overall difference existed.

An analysis of teacher's perceptions of the emphasis which evaluators placed upon each of Mitzel's process, product, and presage criteria categories showed the emphasis to be placed upon process criteria. A similar analysis of preferred criteria showed that the majority of teachers preferred the emphasis to be on process criteria



and that increased emphasis be placed upon product criteria.

Twenty-eight significant relationships between characteristics of respondents and their perceptions of the importance given to the listed evaluation criteria. Ten of these relationships pertained to the age of the respondent variable. Twenty significant relationships existed between the personal and professional variables and the preferred importance given to the evaluative criteria.





## Chapter 6

### COMMENTS ON THE STUDY

Teachers were invited to make comments regarding the evaluation of teachers, the personnel employed for evaluation, or about the study itself. Twenty-seven percent of the respondents accepted the invitation. The large number of comments (95) was taken to be an indication of teachers' concern about teacher evaluation.

The comments were classified under the following headings:

1. General reaction to the instrument
2. Evaluation personnel
3. Evaluation criteria
4. Frequency of evaluation
5. General comments.

Because of the large number of comments and the length of some of these, only a few representative ones have been included below. These comments were included as written by the respondents.

#### General Reaction to the Instrument

Some of the questions in this study sheet were difficult to answer with accuracy because many of the statements can be qualified in various ways depending on the area in which you are employed.



After asking the first four to six questions--why is it that you just don't ask the teacher's name. I suppose its just not needed then.

Questionnaires like these are so lengthy and oftentimes questions are vague. I spent quite a while at filling this questionnaire with considerable thought. Yet I wonder whether the following day and more thought would perhaps have changed my responses. (Am I evaluating your questionnaire?)

(1) I feel there is insufficient choice in your response key; surely there is an area between great importance and little importance. (2) I don't think your instrument will give you results that will be either reliable or valid. But I'll still be interested in reading them.

Student teachers could be good evaluators of teachers. Other teachers can only evaluate socially unless allowed interroom visitations.

I'm not sure of what you meant by existing conditions: existing in my own mind and classroom, or existing in the system itself?

Many of the questions have extenuating circumstances which cannot be expressed on the sheet and space provided.

This is extremely difficult and vague to be handled and attacked by us; since we really do not yet have any such type of merit rating in our system here.

A look in future development, however, would seem to suggest the implementation of a type of teacher evaluation program.

This is a very difficult questionnaire to understand and also to see the purpose of. Your objectives are not very clear.

Many questions are liable to several interpretations.

### Evaluation Personnel

I think there should be more evaluation of a teacher by his colleagues, his department head and his principal. I feel many superintendents are "out of touch" with what goes on in the classroom or in a particular subject area. Superintendents "barge" into your classroom and expect to see you at your best. The teacher may be having an off day for one of many reasons. I feel that external evaluations by administrators are not too valid. Evaluation should be done by colleagues in your





subject area. There should also be more emphasis on self-evaluation I feel that I know when I am doing a good job or have taught an exceptional class.

Evaluation by a visiting superintendent or other supervisory personnel (visiting) is unrealistic and worthless because:

- (1) some teachers keep special plugged lessons ready for such events,
- (2) these evaluating visitors, being too seldom on the classroom scene, create an unnatural climate based on the teacher's fear of the evaluator's power.

Therefore, evaluation should be based on observations of the principal, other teachers on staff and, not lastly, the students. The teacher knows also whether the daily performance is meritable.

As a principal I would rather see a team approach involving the teacher, the principal, and central office personnel. The teacher would provide a written statement of emphases for self improvement at the beginning of the year. During the year areas for needing improvement would be followed up and evaluated with summary copy for the teacher. It seems that the principal is necessarily involved.

Unfortunately your questionnaire is quite inadequate to probe a fuller picture of constructive suggestions and appears to force one's views to converge onto an expected consensus.

The basic philosophy of Evaluators, whoever they are, would be the most important concern. A man with the dogmas of one or two education faculties would be limited. His views would be coloured and limited. A set of standards and thorough background, therefore, in the evaluator, would be most important.

I believe in training children to be responsible. When a teacher has acquired professional status I believe that they definitely should be responsible. I might be all right to check them originally but I do believe that there are so many ways of checking--such as results as seen from both curricular and extra-curricular activities. I believe that professionals should definitely self-evaluate.

Administrators who have been too long away from the classroom are not the best judges of a teacher's capabilities.

The principal and department head are in the best position to evaluate success of a teacher within a school. However, I would not want to be in the position





of the principal and have to make the decision re a teacher's dismissal or related actions.

Teacher evaluation in the province is carried out almost exclusively by personnel who have themselves been removed from the classroom for several years. This is a mistake since schools today are not what they used to be in "the good old days." By that I mean that they are neither better or worse, but they are different. I think teachers should be evaluated by those who are teaching an equal load and are still actively engaged in teaching.

I feel that evaluation of a teacher should never be based on one school superintendent, one principal, one group of students, etc. An over-all performance in different teaching situations would have to be adopted which in turn would also require several years to complete.

Many forces should be considered in teacher evaluation, and discretion must be used in interpreting student, principal, self assessment, etc. Different disciplines and different situations are unique and require unique evaluation. This questionnaire doesn't really allow for justification of "preferred evaluation techniques."

The people charged with evaluation of teachers should have a broad knowledge of people, society, and human nature. A good evaluation might be made if the teacher, as well as the students, were not thought of as machines.

All personnel employed for the purpose of evaluation should also be in contact with the level they are involved with, as teachers, perhaps on a part time basis. Many educators today have forgotten or never been in contact with students and learning of today. As one of today's educators I question value judgments from one of yesterday's educators.

I believe that well disciplined, learned students are the end result of all teaching and that somewhere somehow their evaluation and considerations should become a part of the evaluation process.

Evaluation by others is necessary but would be more effective if there could be a follow-up of these evaluations where the teacher could study the evaluation with the evaluator and discuss both his strong points and his weak points and also feel free to defend himself if he feels that he was incorrectly assessed.



I would hope that the teacher himself, his colleagues, and his principal could become more involved in evaluating teachers, through this survey.

### Evaluation Criteria

Section III is very poorly worded. You want a black and white answer in idealistic situations. For questions such as 5,7,8,10,11,13,16,19,22,25, and 28, the quality of student, home backing, resources available, physical conditions of the school, extra curricular activities of the student: these and many more elements come into play. A teacher often has strong odds against her causing progress in a student, especially the home situation of a child. These qualities of self expression, morals, self control, etc. do not always become apparent immediately but the effect of a particular teacher may manifest itself when the child matures more. What I'm trying to say is an inch of progress with one child may require more ability, more energy and more interest than two miles of progress with another child. For someone to come in and judge a teacher without knowing the students individually is a farce.

I found many of the criteria difficult to respond to confidently. An example of what I mean is: The importance given to "the attitude of the pupils to the school and to authority" in evaluating a teacher. If this criterion suggests that a competent teacher should be capable of altering the pupils' attitudes, then my response would be "2." There are many other factors which have a strong influence on the pupils' attitudes. If the criterion suggests that pupils' attitudes would obviously affect the teacher's methods and possibly "success" in teaching, then it would be of great importance.

I would also like to comment that the importance of many of the criteria would vary according to age group or grade level.

Evaluation of teachers should definitely be made to a greater extent. The intelligence of a teacher has little effect on her good job with her students (within limitations of course). You do not have to have "A" marks to be a good teacher. A good teacher is one who is loved by the students because they have really learned a lot during the year both material in books as well as behavior and respect for others. Things like this should be evaluated.





The basis should be on how well a teacher can communicate with the student as a human being firstly. When this has been accomplished, the teacher will be able to understand each student, thus being able to make the teaching methods used most effective for each individual. To me this is the basic requirement for a successful method of education.

I question some of the criteria for evaluation of teachers. Some of them regarding a pupil's appreciation of moral and ethical standards, attitudes to school and to authority, and courtesy, industry and self-reliance depend greatly on the area in which you are teaching and the home situation. Can one standardize such criteria?

If a teacher is to be evaluated by pupil attitudes and behavior, a thorough study of the children's background and homes would be necessary. Class behavior, attitudes, self-reliance, and appreciation of moral and ethical standards cannot be instilled in one year when a child has been raised differently. The change of behavior rather than behavior observed for five minutes would be a better indicator of what a teacher has done.

I did not understand what was being asked in question 29 above. I do feel that since teachers play an important role in society, that he be evaluated in all aspects of the roles they play in society.

### Frequency of Evaluation

Evaluation should be done continuously--he or she should be in the classroom constantly--and not through hearsay or spotchecks--such evaluation would be unmerited.

Any evaluation which is made occasionally could be very, very way out. A great deal of research and time observing events surrounding each teacher is needed to make a fair evaluation.

I for one disagree that one visit is enough for so important a report as our evaluation. I happen to run a "lax" class by some "standards" but if my students cover the course and a third more outside readings, was it "lax"? One visit would say so. Noise in excess prohibits learning, but the teacher knowing the class, also knows the level where learning stops. This is one of my gripes (a blatant one) about one shot evaluation.



Can a teacher truly be evaluated by one or two superintendents visits, as is now the case? Could not evaluation be done yearly--on a pupil response basis?

### General Comments

I feel that the visits from the Superintendent and the supervisors appear to be on too strict a basis. Personally I enjoy being observed while teaching as it gives me an indication as to whether I'm progressing and improving. However, it seems that a majority of teachers are frightened of these visits because they seem so stoic and final. Is there not some way a closer relationship between supervisor and teacher could be developed, as these visits are really an advantage for us all? I think evaluations of this sort are truly beneficial.

I feel teachers are evaluated to appease teachers at the present time. Until evaluation is done in order to improve standards of teaching (not teaching qualifications), evaluation is going to be a waste of time.

Just as we have continuous evaluation of students, continuous evaluation of teachers would be helpful, especially if evaluation and constructive criticism as well as development of teacher-personnel rapport were taking place.

I have found many of the questions vague and I do believe that a questionnaire on such a multiple topic, particularly based on such direct questioning is exceedingly difficult to answer. If teachers are direct, open, and honest, and if they have entered teaching with the knowledge, creativity, individualism, and flexibility demanded by the situation, they are their own best evaluators, and people working in close contact who know the situation are also beneficial. Teaching is too complex not to take the individual circumstances to mind. Evaluation based on too many impersonal forms is invalid.

Formative evaluation is excellent, but what worries me is that I should be under the gun so to speak--that is--paycheck wise. I feel that if a teacher is effective she should be retained, if not effective, fired as in other professions.

In my opinion, no evaluation in any form can be completely successful. Results--long term results, are the only thing that give any real evaluation. Even at





that, there are so many variables that no mere mortal can accurately judge a teacher.

The writer is rather ignorant of the methods used to evaluate teachers largely because the criteria used are not widely published if they do exist.



## Chapter 7

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

#### SUMMARY OF THE STUDY

This study was designed to examine the perceptions of teachers in an urban Saskatchewan school district at one point in time regarding (1) the existing and preferred use of evaluation personnel and (2) the existing and preferred importance given to evaluation criteria.

This study attempted to find answers to the following questions: To what extent do certain personnel evaluate teachers in the urban Saskatchewan school district selected? Which personnel are preferred by these teachers? Are there any significant relationships between teachers' perceptions of existing and preferred evaluation personnel and certain personal and professional variables? What is the importance given to evaluation criteria as perceived by these teachers? What importance given to these criteria do they prefer? Which of Mitzel's categories of product, process, and presage criteria are emphasized in the existing and preferred situation? Are there any significant relationships between teachers' perceptions of existing and preferred evaluation criteria and certain personal professional variables?



The instrument consisted of four sections. Section I consisted of six personal and professional variables. Section II consisted of nine types of personnel which may be involved in the evaluation of teachers. Teachers were asked to indicate their perceptions of the use of these evaluators in the existing and preferred evaluation situation. Section III of the instrument consisted of the thirty evaluative criteria, ten in each of Mitzel's categories of product, process, and presage. Teachers were asked to indicate their perceptions of the importance of these criteria in the existing and preferred evaluation situation. In Section IV teachers were invited to comment on evaluation and/or the study.

The population consisted of four hundred and sixty-eight teachers in an urban Saskatchewan school district.

The statistical procedures utilized to analyze the data included frequency counts to determine the existing and preferred use of evaluators and criteria, and to place these personnel and criteria in rank order for the existing and preferred situation to enable comparisons to be made; the Spearman rho calculation to determine whether or not any overall differences existed between the existing and preferred situation and the ranking of evaluation personnel and criteria as perceived in the two situations; and chi square tests to determine significant relationships between the six personal and professional teacher variables and





and existing and preferred use of evaluation personnel, and to determine significant relationships between the six personal and professional variables and the existing and preferred importance given to evaluation criteria.

A sample of teachers' comments on evaluation and the study were classified under the following headings: General Reaction to the Instrument; Evaluation Personnel; Evaluation Criteria; Frequency of Evaluation; and General Comments.

The different analyses of the data revealed the following:

1. The majority of respondents perceived two types of evaluation personnel to be used extensively in evaluating teacher effectiveness, namely, their school board superintendent and their principal. Other types of evaluation personnel were perceived to be infrequently used as evaluators.

2. The majority of respondents preferred the principal and their school board superintendent to be used extensively as evaluators, and they preferred the other types of personnel to be used infrequently in teacher evaluation.

3. There was no overall difference in the use of evaluators between the existing and preferred situation.

4. Several significant relationships existed between the personal and professional teacher variables and the existing and preferred use of evaluation personnel.



The majority of these relationships pertained to the level of instruction variable.

5. The majority of respondents perceived sixteen of the thirty criteria to be given great importance in the existing evaluation situation.

6. The majority of respondents preferred that twenty-eight of the thirty be given great importance when teachers are evaluated.

7. Although there were substantial differences in rank for many of the criteria listed, no overall difference was found.

8. The respondents perceived the existing emphasis to be placed on process evaluative criteria, and preferred to have the emphasis on these criteria. However, they also preferred an increase in emphasis on product criteria.

9. Several significant relationships existed between the personal and professional variables and the existing and preferred evaluation criteria. The majority of these pertained to the age of the respondents and the position held variables in the existing situation, and to the age of the respondents and the number of years of post-secondary education in the preferred situation.

#### CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The following conclusions and implications were drawn from the analysis of the data:



1. Teachers' perceptions of the extent to which the listed personnel are used in evaluation of teacher effectiveness identified two types of evaluators who are used extensively, namely, the school board superintendent and the principal. It would appear that both types of personnel perform dual roles in that they are evaluators as well as educational leaders. Since the other types of personnel, especially those internal to the school, were perceived to be infrequently used, one might also conclude that the emphasis was on summative rather than formative evaluation.

2. Teachers' preference for extensive use of the principal and the school board superintendent in teacher evaluation can be interpreted as an indication that teachers were satisfied with the existing evaluation personnel. However, the preference for infrequent use of the other personnel could also be seen as an indication that the teachers do not wish the frequency of evaluation to increase.

The preference for infrequent use of personnel from the Provincial Teachers' Organization and the Provincial Department of Education suggested that teachers desired autonomy for their school system and rejected involvement of personnel external to the system in teacher evaluation. The comments made in this regard suggested that teachers rejected these personnel because they have been out of the classroom situation too long and are,





therefore, unaware of the changes which have taken place in students and in teaching.

3. The preference for the principal as an evaluator supported the literature which suggested that the principal should always be involved in teacher evaluation.

This information should serve as encouragement for principals to play a major role in teacher evaluation and as a basis on which to request additional time to conduct teacher evaluation. It should also indicate to the school board administration that an in-service evaluation training program for principals should be initiated.

4. The comparison of the use of evaluation personnel in the existing and preferred situation indicated that no overall difference existed between the use of these personnel in both situations. This suggested a general satisfaction with the extent to which the listed personnel were used in the evaluation of teacher effectiveness.

Although there was no overall difference between the use of existing and preferred evaluators, some noticeable differences were indicated regarding the extent of use of certain evaluators. The preferred decrease in the use of the superintendent as an evaluator suggested that teachers prefer evaluation procedures to be conducted by personnel with whom they have more frequent contact and who have closer contact with the classroom situation. This was also supported by an increase in the preferred use of





department heads, self, and students as evaluators.

5. Teachers' comments on evaluation personnel suggested that no one person should have sole responsibility for teacher evaluation, but rather that teacher evaluation should be carried out by several people and more frequently. This was seen as an indication that teachers are concerned about evaluation and that they do desire professional development and growth.

In some cases the respondents who differed in the six personal and professional variables responded differently to different types of evaluators. Since the majority of these differences pertained to the level of instruction variable, consideration should be given to the types of evaluators to be used at different levels of instruction.

7. Since sixteen criteria were identified as being given great importance, it was concluded that a common body of criteria was used in teacher evaluation. Teachers who had class control and well-prepared and well-planned lessons, and who displayed energy, force and enthusiasm in teaching were likely to be considered effective teachers. Little attention was given to the results of teaching. There may be good reason to de-emphasize product criteria, but research evidence suggests that these criteria deserve greater emphasis when teachers are evaluated.

8. Teachers perceived an effective teacher to be one who is concerned with the all-round development of the



pupils, who displays energy, force and enthusiasm in teaching, and who is concerned with the character development of the pupils.

9. The majority of respondents indicated that twenty-eight of the thirty listed criteria should be used in teacher evaluation. The possibility, therefore, exists that these criteria could be used as a basis for development of an evaluation system.

10. Although no overall difference existed between the existing and preferred importance of evaluation criteria, and although teachers tended to prefer the emphasis to remain on process criteria, there were substantial differences in the importance given to certain criteria. Teachers' preference for increased emphasis on product criteria was seen as an indication of the need to re-examine existing evaluation criteria to determine required modification of the importance given to these criteria.

11. In some cases the respondents who differed in the six personal and professional variables responded differently to different evaluation criteria. It was concluded that these differences should be taken into account when modification of existing evaluation criteria are considered. Such consideration would lead to a greater acceptance of the criteria used.

12. From the comments it was concluded that teachers are vitally concerned about evaluation personnel



and criteria. It would appear that teachers desired some changes in the existing evaluation personnel and criteria. A co-operative approach to determine such changes is warranted. School board administrators should establish a committee comprised of teachers, who reflect the personal and professional teacher characteristics, and school board administrators to examine existing evaluation procedures and to determine the required changes.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH AND STUDY

Studies need to be undertaken to determine whether or not differences in the use of evaluation personnel and/or the importance given to evaluation criteria exist when a distinction is made between summative and formative evaluation.

Experimental studies could be carried out to determine the validity and reliability of student and/or department head evaluations of teacher effectiveness. Similar studies could pertain to self-evaluation and peer evaluations.

The effect of co-operative development of an evaluation guide on evaluation procedures and/or teaching could be examined.

A replication of this study could be conducted in other urban Saskatchewan school districts to determine whether or not any differences in teachers' perceptions





exist in these districts regarding teacher evaluation. Such information could provide valuable information regarding the direction of evaluation procedures.

Research is required into the methods by which evaluators collect data on which to base evaluation to determine the most valid and reliable measurement techniques.

Studies could be carried out to determine the role of evaluation in the process of supervision.

Evaluation of teacher effectiveness is important to persons directly involved in education and to persons concerned about education. Teachers occupy an important position in the field of education; their selection and evaluation should be a matter of the deepest concern, and should therefore be made on the basis of sound evaluation criteria and by personnel who are qualified to evaluate them.



## REFERENCES



## REFERENCES

- Anderson, C. C. and Hunka, S. M.  
1963. "Teacher Evaluation: Some Problems and a Proposal," Harvard Education Review, 33. pp. 74-95.
- Andrews, J.  
1959. "The Principal--A Unique Supervisor," The Alberta School Principal, 3. pp. 58-73.
- Bargen, P. F.  
1965. "Should a Principal Evaluate Teachers?" CSA Bulletin 4, 3. pp. 3-18.
- Barr, A. S.  
1961. "Wisconsin Studies of the Measurement and Prediction of Teacher Effectiveness, A Summary of Investigations," Journal of Experimental Education, 30, September. pp. 5-156.
1958. "The Measurement and Prediction of Teacher Efficiency," Review of Educational Research, 28 3, June. pp. 256-262.
1948. "The Measurement and Prediction of Teaching Efficiency: A Summary of Investigations," Journal of Experimental Education, 16, June. pp. 203-217.
- Beery, J. R.  
1962. "Does Professional Preparation Make a Difference?" Journal of Teacher Education, XIII, 4, December. pp. 386-395.
- Biddle, B. J.  
1964. "The Integration of Teacher Effectiveness Research," Contemporary Research on Teacher Effectiveness. B. Biddle and W. J. Ellena, eds. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston. pp. 1-40.
- Biddle, B. and Ellena, W. J., eds.  
1964. Contemporary Research on Teacher Effectiveness. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.



- Bledsoe, J. C., Brown, I. D., and Strickland, A. D.  
 1971. "Factors Related to Pupil Observation Reports of Teachers and Attitudes Toward Their Teacher," Journal of Educational Research, 65, 3, November. pp. 119-126.
- Bolton, D. L.  
 1971. Teacher Evaluation. Prep 21. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Communication. Office of Education (DHEW).
- Bowers, N. D. and Soar, R. S.  
 1962. "The Influence of Teacher Personality on Classroom Interaction," Journal of Experimental Education, 30, 4, June. pp. 309-311.
- Boyer, M.  
 1970. "Teacher Evaluation: Toward Improving Instruction," Junior College Research Review, 4, 5, January. pp. 4-7.
- Brain, G.  
 1965. "Evaluating Teacher Effectiveness," NEA Journal, 54, 2, February. pp. 35-36.
- Brighton, S. F.  
 1965. Increasing Your Accuracy in Teacher Evaluation. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Brown, A. F.  
 1962. "Teaching Under Stress," The Canadian Administrator, 1, 6, March. pp. 25-30.
- Byrne, T. C.  
 1965. "Evaluation: Is Your Infallability Showing?" Canadian Education and Research Digest, 5, December. pp. 297-308.  
 1962. "Good Teaching and Good Teachers," Canadian Administrator, 1, 5, February. pp. 19-24.
- Cogan, M. L.  
 1963. "Research on the Behavior of Teachers: A New Phase," Journal of Teacher Education, 14. pp. 238-243.
- Commission on Teacher Evaluation of the Association for  
 1950. Supervision and Curriculum Development, National Education Association. Better Than Rating. Washington.





Davis, H.

1964. "Evolution of Current Practices in Evaluating Teacher Competence," Contemporary Research on Teacher Effectiveness. B. Biddle and W. J. Ellena, eds. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston. pp. 41-66.

Dial, D. E.

1970. "Self-Appraisal: A New Approach to Teacher Evaluation," School and Community, 56, 6, February. pp. 22-23.

Dugan, R. R.

1961. "Personality and the Effective Teacher," Journal of Teacher Education, XII, 3, September. pp. 335-339.

Egnatoff, J. G.

1971. "A New Look at Evaluating Teacher Performance," Education Canada, 2, 4, December. pp. 19-21.

Ellena, W. J., Stevenson, M., and Webb, H. P., eds.

1961. Question: Who's a Good Teacher? Washington: American Association of School Administrators.

Ely, L. E.

1959. "Teachers' Reactions to School Evaluations Using Evaluative Criteria," Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, 43, 25, December. pp. 38-43.

Enns, F.

1965. "Should Principals Formally Rate Teachers?" CSA Bulletin, 4, 3. pp. 19-40.

1963. "Supervision: A Rationale," The Canadian Administrator, 2, 7, April. pp. 27-30.

- "Evaluation of Teaching Competence," NEA Research Bulletin, 1969. 47, October. pp. 67-75.

Fattu, N. A.

1962. "Effectiveness--An Elusive Quality," Education Digest, 27, January. pp. 24-26.

Flanagan, C. E.

1961. "A Study of the Relationship of Scores on the MMPI to Success in Teaching as Indicated by Supervisory Ratings," Journal of Experimental Education, 29, 4, June. pp. 329-354.



Flanders, N. A.

1969. "Teacher Effectiveness," Encyclopedia of Educational Research (4th ed.). A Project of the A.E.R.A., Robert L. Ebel, ed. New York: The Macmillan Company. pp. 1423-1437.

1962. "Using Interaction Analysis in the Inservice Training of Teachers," Journal of Experimental Education, 30, 4, June. pp. 313-316.

1961. "Analysing Teacher Behavior," Educational Leadership, 19, December. pp. 173-178.

Forbes, J. E.

1965. "You Can Measure Teaching Quality--Even if it Hurts," Grade Teacher, 83. p. 54.

Freehill, M. F.

1963. "The Prediction of Teaching Competence," Journal of Experimental Education, 31, 3, March. pp. 307-311.

Gage, N. L.

1967. "Successful Teacher Behavior: Can Science Contribute to the Act of Teaching?" Proceedings: The Education of Elementary School Teachers. 2nd Invitational Conference on Elementary Education. Banff. pp. 7-16.

1965. "Desirable Behaviors of Teachers," Urban Education, 1. pp. 85-95.

1963a. "A Method for 'Improving' Teacher Behavior," Journal of Teacher Education, 14. pp. 261-266.

1963b. Handbook of Research on Teaching. A Project of the A.E.R.A. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Gallagher, J. J.

1968. "Expressive Thoughts by Gifted Children in the Classroom," Elementary English, 42. pp. 559-568.

Gathercole, F. J.

1962. "The Professional Development of Staff," The Canadian Administrator, II, 3, December. pp. 9-12.

Getzels, J. W. and Jackson, P. W.

1963. "The Teacher's Personality and Characteristics," Handbook of Research on Teaching. N. L. Gage, ed. Chicago: Rand McNally. pp. 506-582.



Green, W. J.

1971. Relationships Between Teacher Attitudes and Self-ratings of Success in Teaching. Unpublished Master's thesis, The University of Alberta, Edmonton.

Hall, H. D.

1964. "Professional Preparation and Teacher Effectiveness," Journal of Teacher Education, 15, pp. 72-76.

Harsh, J. R.

1970. "A Look at Teacher Evaluation," Paper Presented at the Annual Conference of the American Association of School Administrators, Las Vegas, Nevada, October 22.

Hawkins, E. E. and Stoops, E.

1966. "Objective and Subjective Identification of Outstanding Elementary Teachers," Journal of Educational Research, 59, 8, April. pp. 344-346.

Heil, L. M. and Washburn, C.

1962. "Brooklyn College Research in Teacher Effectiveness," The Journal of Educational Research, 55, 8, May. pp. 347-351.

Joyce, B. R. and Hodges, R. E.

1966. "A Rationale for Teacher Education," The Elementary School Journal, 66, February. pp. 254-266.

Klahn, R. P., ed.

1965. Evaluation of Teacher Competency. Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Franklin Publishers.

Kleinman, G. S.

1966. "Assessing Teaching Effectiveness: The State of the Art," Science Education, 50, 3, April. pp. 234-237.

Laurits, J.

1967. "Thoughts on Evaluation of Teaching," The Evaluation of Teaching. Washington: Pi Lambda Theta. pp. 32-42.

Lawler, E. S.

1964. "Differing Rates of Progress of Classes Under the Same and Different Teachers," Journal of Educational Research, 58, 2, October. pp. 84-86.







- McBeath, A. G.  
1959. Teacher Leader Behaviour and Its Relation to Teacher Effectiveness. Unpublished Master's thesis, The University of Alberta, Edmonton.
- MacKay, D. A.  
1971. "Evaluation of Teaching: A New Look" The Canadian Administrator, X, 4, January. pp. 15-19.
- McNally, H. J.  
1972. "Teacher Evaluation That Makes a Difference," Educational Leadership, 29, 4, January. pp. 353-357.
- McNeil, J. D.  
1971. Toward Accountable Teachers. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Incorporated.
- Medley, D. M. and Mitzel, H. E.  
1963. "Measuring Classroom Behavior by Systematic Observation," Handbook of Research on Teaching. N. L. Gage, ed. Chicago: Rand McNally. pp. 247-328.
1962. "A Tentative Framework for the Study of Effective Teacher Behavior," Journal of Experimental Education, 30, 4, June. pp. 317-320.
- Metzner, S.  
1970. "The Teacher as Viewed by his Principal," Changing Education, 4, Winter. p. 25.
- Mitzel, H. E.  
1960. "Teacher Effectiveness Criteria," Encyclopedia of Educational Research (3rd ed.). New York: The Macmillan Company. pp. 1481-1486.
- Moore, T. J.  
1966. An Identification and Analysis of the Criteria Employed in Teacher Evaluation. Unpublished Master's thesis, The University of Alberta, Edmonton.
- Morsh, J. E. and Wilder, E. W.  
1954. "Identifying the Effective Instructor," A Review of the Quantitative Studies, 1900-1952. Chanute Air Force Base, Ill.: Air Force Personnel and Training Research Center. ED 044 371.
- Moss, R. L.  
1971. "Teacher Evaluation," School and Community, 57, 5, January. pp. 16-17.



- Mueller, D. G.  
1971. "How to Evaluate Teaching," Teacher Education, XXII, 2, Summer, pp. 229-244.
- Musella, D.  
1970. "Improving Teacher Evaluation," The Journal of Teacher Education, 21, Spring. pp. 15-21.
- Ornstein, A. C.  
1970. "Methods for Conducting Teacher Behavior Research: With Implications for Educating the Disadvantaged." (Mimeographed.)
- Owens, M. S.  
1971. "Evaluation of Teaching Competence by Three Groups of Educators," Journal of Experimental Education, 40, 2. pp. 77-82.
- Phillips, R. C.  
1968. Evaluation in Education. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company.
- Pi Lambda Theta  
1967. The Evaluation of Teaching. Washington: Pi Lambda Theta.
- Rasmussen, F. A. and Holobinko, P.  
1971. "Teachers Rate Themselves," Clearing House, 46, 4, December. pp. 207-211.
- Ratsoy, E. W.  
1971. "Accounting for Differences in Teacher Effectiveness Criteria," The Canadian Administrator, X, 8, May. pp. 35-39.
- Rayder, N. F.  
1968. College Students' Ratings of Instructors. Office of Education Series, Michigan State University. ED 021 527.
- Roberson, E. W.  
1971. "Teacher Self-Appraisal: A Way to Improve Instruction," Journal of Teacher Education, 22, 4, Winter. pp. 469-473.
- Rogers, K. G.  
1970. An Empirical Study of the Criteria of Teacher Evaluation Employed by High School Principals in Alberta. Unpublished Master's thesis, The University of Alberta, Edmonton.



- Rose, G. W.  
 1963. "The Effects of Administrative Evaluation," The National Elementary Principal, 43, November. pp. 50-56.  
 1958. "Toward Evaluation of Teaching," Educational Leadership, 15. pp. 231-238.
- Rosenshine, B.  
 1970. "Evaluation of Classroom Instruction," Review of Educational Research, 40, 2, April. pp. 279-300.
- Ryans, D. G.  
 1967. "Teacher Behavior Can Be Evaluated," The Evaluation of Teaching. Washington: Pi Lambda Theta. pp. 43-64.  
 1964. "Research on Teacher Behavior in the Context of Teacher Characteristics Study," Contemporary Research on Teacher Effectiveness. B. Biddle and W. J. Ellena, eds. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston. pp. 67-101.  
 1963. "Teacher Behavior Theory and Research: Implications for Teacher Education," Journal of Teacher Education, 14. pp. 274-293.  
 1960a. "Prediction of Teacher Effectiveness," Encyclopedia of Educational Research (3rd ed.). New York: The Macmillan Company, pp. 1488-1491.  
 1960b. Characteristics of Teachers. Washington: American Council on Education.
- Siegel, S.  
 1956. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.
- Simon, A. and Boyer, G., eds.  
 1970. Mirrors for Behavior: An Anthology of Classroom Observation Instruments. Vols. I-XIV. Philadelphia, Pa.: Research for Better Schools, Inc.
- Simpson, R. H.  
 1966. Teacher Self-Evaluation. New York: The Macmillan Company.
- Smith, B. O.  
 1967. "Teaching: Conditions of Its Evaluation," The Evaluation of Teaching. Washington: Pi Lambda Theta. pp. 65-84.





- Smith, B. O.  
1962 "Conceptual Frameworks for Analysis of Classroom Social Interaction," Journal of Experimental Education, 30, 4, June. pp. 325-326.
- Soar, R. W.  
1964. "Methodological Problems in Predicting Teacher Effectiveness," Journal of Experimental Education, 32, 3. pp. 287-291.
- Squire, J. R. and Applebee, R. K.  
1964. High School Departments of English: Their Organization, Administration, and Supervision. R. J. Lacampagne, ed. Chicago: University of Illinois.
- Stufflebeam, D. L. and others.  
1971. Educational Evaluation and Decision Making. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, Incorporated.
- Thomas, E. B.  
1969. An Examination of the Criteria of Teacher Evaluation Employed by High School Principals in Victoria, Australia. Unpublished Master's thesis, The University of Alberta, Edmonton.
- Turner, R. L.  
1970. "Good Teaching and Its Contexts," Phi Delta Kappa, 52, 3. pp. 155-158.  
  
1964. "Teaching as Problem-Solving Behavior: A Strategy," Contemporary Research on Teacher Effectiveness. B. Biddle and W. J. Ellena, eds. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston. pp. 102-126.
- Turner, R. L. and Fattu, N. A.  
1960a. "Problem Solving Proficiency Among Elementary School Teachers," Indiana University School of Education Monograph.  
  
1960b. "Skill in Teaching: A Reappraisal of the Concepts and Strategies in Teacher Effectiveness Research," Indiana University School of Education Bulletin, 36, 3.
- Vander Werf, L. S.  
1958. How to Evaluate Teachers and Teaching. New York: Rinehart and Company.
- Vittetoe, J. O.  
1971. "Evaluating Teachers," School and Community, 57, 6, February. pp. 7-8.





Whitworth, F. E.

1968. On Organizing R & D in Education. Ottawa:  
Canadian Council for Research in Education.

Wick, J. W. and Beggs, D. L.

1971. Evaluation for Decision-Making in the Schools.  
Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Worth, W. H.

1961. "Can Administrators Rate Teachers?" The Canadian  
Administrator, 1, 1, October. pp. 1-6.

Ziolkowski, E. H.

1965. "Practices in the Supervision of Instruction,"  
The Canadian Administrator, V, 1, October. pp.  
1-4.



APPENDIX A  
THE INSTRUMENT AND LETTERS



# TEACHER EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

155

There are FOUR SECTIONS to this instrument:

Section I. Personal and professional data questionnaire.

Section II. Existing and Preferred Evaluators.

Section III. Existing and Preferred Evaluation Criteria.

Section IV. Comments on the evaluation of teachers and/or the study.

It will take you approximately 15 minutes of your time to complete the questionnaire.

You are asked to enclose the completed instrument in the envelope provided and to return it to your principal who will forward all questionnaires completed in your school to me. Please do this at your earliest convenience.

An abstract of the findings will be made available to all participating schools after the study is completed. No individuals or individual schools will be identified in the study.

## Section I: PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL DATA

Name of School .....

In which ONE of these grade levels do you spend most instructional time? Check (✓) one.

(1).....Do not teach    (2).....K-3    (3).....4-6    (4).....7-9    (5).....10-12

Age (nearest birthday): Check (✓) one.

(1).....25 or under    (4).....36-40    (7).....51-55  
(2).....26-30    (5).....41-45    (8).....56-60  
(3).....31-35    (6).....46-50    (9).....61 or over

Sex: (1).....Male    (2).....Female

What is your total number of years of teaching, counselling, library and/or administrative experience? Count this year as a full year. Check (✓) one.

(1).....1 yr.    (4).....5-9 yrs.    (7).....20-24 yrs.  
(2).....2 yrs.    (5).....10-14 yrs.    (8).....25-34 yrs.  
(3).....3-4 yrs.    (6).....15-19 yrs.    (9).....35 or more years.

What is your position in the school? Check (✓) one.

(1).....Principal  
(2).....Vice-Principal or Assistant Principal  
(3).....Department Head, Grade Co-ordinator, Curricular Associate  
(4).....Teacher  
(5).....Other (Specify) .....

For how many full years of post-secondary education (preparation or training) are you paid? Check (✓) one.

(1).....1 yr.    (3).....3 yrs.    (5).....5 yrs.  
(2).....2 yrs.    (4).....4 yrs.    (6).....6 or more years.

**Evaluation** is an assessment by measurement, rating, or ranking of teacher effectiveness involving value judgments based on observations. Evaluation may be formative (for the purpose of promoting the professional growth and development of the teacher) or summative (for the purpose of official reporting of the effectiveness of the teacher which may lead to a decision regarding the acceptability of teacher performance).

Please keep these definitions in mind as you complete the remainder of the questionnaire.

Section II: EXISTING AND PREFERRED EVALUATORS

Instructions:

This section lists 9 types of personnel which may be involved in evaluating teachers. You are asked to indicate your perception of the extent to which each type of personnel **is used** in teacher evaluation (EXISTING) and the extent to which each type of personnel **should be** used in teacher evaluation (PREFERRED).

Please respond to each question by marking the number that corresponds to one of the following statements:

- 5. personnel **always** used in the evaluation of teachers
- 4. personnel **frequently** used in the evaluation of teachers
- 3. **undecided** about the extent of use
- 2. personnel **seldom** used in the evaluation of teachers
- 1. personnel **never** used in the evaluation of teachers
- 0. **do not know** the extent of use

Example:

What do you perceive to be the Existing and Preferred extent of use of \_\_\_\_\_ in the evaluation of teacher effectiveness?

	Existing						Preferred				
1. The Minister of Education	5	4	3	2	1	0	5	4	3	2	1

The responses indicate that the respondent perceives that the minister of education is frequently **used** in the evaluation of teachers, however, he would prefer that the minister of education **should seldom be used** in the evaluation of teachers.

RESPONSE KEY																		
5. Always		4. Frequently		3. Undecided		2. Seldom		1. Never		0. Do not know								
								Existing				Preferred						
1. Provincial Department of Education Personnel								5	4	3	2	1	0	5	4	3	2	1
2. Provincial Teachers' Organization Personnel								5	4	3	2	1	0	5	4	3	2	1
3. Your School Board Superintendent								5	4	3	2	1	0	5	4	3	2	1
4. A group of administrators and/or supervisors from your school district central office								5	4	3	2	1	0	5	4	3	2	1
5. Your school principal								5	4	3	2	1	0	5	4	3	2	1
6. Your Department Head, Grade Co-ordinator, or Curricular Associate								5	4	3	2	1	0	5	4	3	2	1
7. Your colleagues (other teachers in your school)								5	4	3	2	1	0	5	4	3	2	1
8. Yourself (by completing a written report)								5	4	3	2	1	0	5	4	3	2	1
9. Your students (by completing a written report)								5	4	3	2	1	0	5	4	3	2	1



### Section III: EXISTING AND PREFERRED EVALUATION CRITERIA

Instructions: 2001

157

This section lists 30 criteria which may be employed in evaluating teachers. You are asked to indicate your perception of the importance that each criterion is **given** in teacher evaluation (EXISTING) and the importance that each criterion **should be given** in teacher evaluation (PREFERRED).

Please respond to each question by marking the number that corresponds to one of the following statements:

- 1. criterion of **very great importance**
- 2. criterion of **great importance**
- 3. **uncertain** about the importance of criterion
- 4. criterion of **little importance**
- 5. criterion of **no importance**
- 6. **do not know** the importance of criterion

Example:

What do you perceive to be the EXISTING and PREFERRED importance given to each of the following criterion in the evaluation of teachers:

	Existing						Preferred					
The self-reliance of the teacher?	5	4	3	2	1	0	5	4	3	2	1	0

The responses indicate that the respondent perceives that this criterion is **given** little importance in the evaluation of teachers, however, he prefers that this criterion **should be** given very great importance in the evaluation of teachers.

#### RESPONSE KEY

5. very great importance    4. great importance    3. undecided    2. little importance    1. no importance    0. do not know

	Existing						Preferred					
Concern with the all-round development of the pupils?	5	4	3	2	1	0	5	4	3	2	1	0
Lesson preparation and planning?	5	4	3	2	1	0	5	4	3	2	1	0
The personality of the teacher?	5	4	3	2	1	0	5	4	3	2	1	0
Examination results?	5	4	3	2	1	0	5	4	3	2	1	0
Pupil participation in class?	5	4	3	2	1	0	5	4	3	2	1	0
The dress and appearance of the teacher?	5	4	3	2	1	0	5	4	3	2	1	0
The pupils work well without supervision?	5	4	3	2	1	0	5	4	3	2	1	0
Teacher-pupil relationships?	5	4	3	2	1	0	5	4	3	2	1	0
Academic qualifications and knowledge of the curriculum?	5	4	3	2	1	0	5	4	3	2	1	0
The development of the process of individual enquiry in the pupils?	5	4	3	2	1	0	5	4	3	2	1	0
Class control?	5	4	3	2	1	0	5	4	3	2	1	0
The level of intelligence of the teacher?	5	4	3	2	1	0	5	4	3	2	1	0
Concern with character development of the pupils?	5	4	3	2	1	0	5	4	3	2	1	0
The energy, force and enthusiasm displayed in teaching?	5	4	3	2	1	0	5	4	3	2	1	0
The professional activities of the teacher?	5	4	3	2	1	0	5	4	3	2	1	0
The training of pupils in civic competence and responsibility?	5	4	3	2	1	0	5	4	3	2	1	0

	Existing	Preferred
17. Supervision and checking of written work?	5 4 3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1
18. The degree of co-operation by the teacher with other staff members?	5 4 3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1
19. Pupil attitudes of courtesy, industry and self-reliance?	5 4 3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1
20. The methods of lesson presentation used?	5 4 3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1
21. The loyalty and dependability of the teacher?	5 4 3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1
22. The pupils' appreciation of moral and ethical standards?	5 4 3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1
23. The use of teaching aids?	5 4 3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1
24. Qualities of leadership displayed by the teacher?	5 4 3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1
25. The training of pupils in self expression?	5 4 3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1
26. The provision made for individual differences and group needs?	5 4 3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1
27. The teacher's participation and standing in the community?	5 4 3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1
28. The attitude of the pupils to the school and to authority?	5 4 3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1
29. The degree of self-evaluation of the processes employed?	5 4 3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1
30. The teacher's standing with the pupils?	5 4 3 2 1 0	5 4 3 2 1

If you wish to make any comments regarding the evaluation of teachers, the personnel employed for evaluation, about this study, please feel free to do so.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION



February, 1972

Dear Principal:

I am requesting your cooperation in distribution and early completion of the enclosed questionnaire. The covering letter to teachers explains the purpose of this study.

Would you please carry out the following procedures:

1. Complete one questionnaire yourself.
2. Distribute one copy of the covering letter, one questionnaire, and one envelope to each staff member in your school who holds a valid teaching certificate.
3. Provide a method to allow teachers to return completed questionnaires.
4. Mail the completed questionnaires in the enclosed stamped addressed envelope.

I am hoping for a high percentage of questionnaire returns to gain a more extensive picture of teachers' views. I hope, therefore, that you will try to obtain replies from every staff member.

I am enclosing two extra copies of the questionnaire for your files.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Adolf J. Volk





February, 1972

Dear Colleague:

The question of evaluation of teacher effectiveness is of concern to the general public, to school administrators, and to teachers. Several research studies have been conducted in this area, but few studies have sought the views and opinions of teachers. The purpose of this study is to examine the perceptions of teachers (including principals) regarding existing evaluation personnel and the criteria they employ, and regarding preferred evaluation personnel and preferred evaluation criteria.

I am requesting that you complete the accompanying questionnaire, place it in the envelope provided, and return it to your principal who will forward the questionnaires to me.

You will find that the questionnaire will take only a short time to complete. May I assure you that individual responses will be treated in the strictest confidence. The data will be presented in the form of consolidated findings. An abstract of these findings will be made available to all participating schools.

Your cooperation and promptness in completing and returning the questionnaire will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Adolf J. Volk







February 21, 1972

Dear Principal:

At the February 1, 1972 Administrator's Dinner Meeting I distributed a package of questionnaires for the teachers in your school relating to my thesis study regarding teacher evaluation. As yet I have had no response from your school so I write to ask if you would be kind enough to collect the completed questionnaires from your teachers and forward them to me as soon as possible.

I am anxious to include your opinions and those of your staff in the consolidated responses, the analysis of which must commence very soon. If you have mislaid the questionnaires I would be pleased to send another set to you.

I realize that principals and teachers are constantly under the pressure of work and I do apologize for the extra demands made on your time, but I do hope that the findings of this study will be informative as well as revealing.

May I take this opportunity to thank you in anticipation for your cooperation and assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

Adolf J. Volk

P.S. If you have already forwarded the completed questionnaires to me please ignore this request.





APPENDIX B

CRITERIA USED IN THE INSTRUMENT  
SET OUT IN CATEGORIES



CRITERIA INCLUDED ALTERNATELY ON THE  
INSTRUMENT GROUPED ACCORDING  
TO MITZEL'S CATEGORIES

A. PRODUCT CRITERIA

1. Concern with the all-round development of the pupils.
2. Examination results.
3. The pupils work well without supervision.
4. The development of the process of individual enquiry in the pupils.
5. Concern with character development of the pupils.
6. The training of pupils in civic competence and responsibility.
7. Pupil attitudes of courtesy, industry and self-reliance.
8. The pupils' appreciation of moral and ethical standards.
9. The training of the pupils in self expression.
10. The attitude of the pupils to the school and to authority.

B. PROCESS CRITERIA

1. Lesson preparation and planning.
2. Pupil participation in lessons.
3. Teacher-pupil relationships.
4. Class control.



5. The energy, force and enthusiasm displayed in teaching.
6. Supervision and checking of written work.
7. The methods of lesson presentation used.
8. The use of teaching aids.
9. The provision made for individual differences and group needs.
10. The degree of self-evaluation of the processes employed.

#### C. PRESAGE CRITERIA

1. The personality of the teacher.
2. The dress and appearance of the teacher.
2. Academic qualifications and knowledge of the curriculum.
4. The level of intelligence of the teacher.
5. The professional activities of the teacher.
6. The degree of co-operation by the teacher with other staff members.
7. The loyalty and dependability of the teacher.
8. Qualities of leadership displayed by the teacher.
9. The teacher's participation and standing in the community.
10. The teacher's standing with the pupils.













**B30035**